School Improvement Plan

School Year: 2010

School District: Grosse Pointe Public Schools

Intermediate School District: Wayne RESA

School Name: George Defer Elementary School

Grades Served: K,1,2,3,4,5

Principal: Ms. Karen Sullivan

Building Code: 01386

District Approval of Plan:

_____
Authorized Official Signature and Date

Board of Education Approval of Plan:

_____
Authorized Official Signature and Date

School Improvement Plan

Contents

Introduction

The Michigan Department of Education, Office of Education Improvement and Innovation and Office of Field Services has developed a series of documents and tools that are designed to assist schools in the creation and use of an **Action Portfolio** that will guide and inform the school's Continuous School Improvement Planning Process.

The **Action Portfolio** begins with the **Michigan School Improvement Framework (MSIF)**. The Framework was designed to:

- Provide schools and districts with a comprehensive framework that describes the elements of effective schools.
- Provide schools and districts in our state with a common way of describing the processes and protocols of practice of effective schools.
- Give direction to, support, and enhance the school improvement planning process.

The School Improvement Framework **Rubrics** assess the framework at the benchmark level, and provide a continuum of practice that allows buildings to identify gaps that exist between where they are in their current practice and where they want to be. The rubrics also include the EdYES! Performance Indicators that schools must use for their annual self-assessment.

The **Comprehensive Needs Assessment (CNA)** is another tool that has been developed as a part of the **Action Portfolio**. This process examines building demographics, system processes and protocols of practices, instructional program, and disaggregated student academic achievement data, so that the following questions can be answered:

- Who do we serve?
- How do we do business?
- Where are we now?
- Where do we want to be?
- What and where are the gaps?
- What is/are the root cause(s) for the gaps?
- How will we get to where we want to be?
- How will we evaluate our efforts and progress?

The CNA will help a school align these system challenges with the student achievement goals the school will establish. Ensuring that your systems are aligned with the elements of effective schools, to support your instructional program goals and objectives, is the first step to establishing the continuous school improvement process.

The **School Improvement Plan template (SIP)** has been designed to provide schools and districts with a common planning template that addresses student learning and system needs that have been identified through the schools? Comprehensive Needs Assessment. It has also been designed to address any federal, state and locally required elements that must be contained in a School Improvement Plan.

The School Improvement Framework, Rubrics, CNA, and the School Improvement Planning template were developed as a comprehensive and continuous process that can provide schools and districts with a way to look at and discuss internal systems and assess where the school is, in relationship to these elements of effective schools.

Copies of these documents can be obtained on the web at: www.mi.gov/schoolimprovement

School Information

School:	**George Defer Elementary School**
District:	**Grosse Pointe Public Schools**
Public/Non-Public:	**Public**
Grades:	**K,1,2,3,4,5**
School Code Number:	**01386**
City:	**GROSSE POINTE PARK**
State/Province:	**Michigan**
Country:	**United States**

Vision

Vision Statement
Our District's Vision is: "Excellence in Education: Learning and Leading for Today and Tomorrow".

Defer Elementary School is a community committed to excellence in learning for all students. We honor and respect the uniqueness of each individual while helping them to develop a sense of responsibility towards themselves and towards their community at large.

Mission Statement
Defer Elementary School community will provide successful experiences for each child to attain self-esteem and the knowledge, skills, and behavior necessary to function effectively and cooperatively in society.

Beliefs Statement
-Every student can learn
-All learning is a lifelong process
-Every student is entitled to the best possible education
-Education is a shared responsibility among educators, parents and community
-Students are responsible for their own learning.
-Every student is entitled to be respected, nurtured, and valued
-Individuals are responsible for the choices they make

Goals

ID	Name	Development Status	Progress Status
4811	Improved Math Skills	Approved	Open
5448	Improved Reading Skills	Approved	Open
4837	Improved Writing Skills	Approved	Open

Goal 1: Improved Math Skills

Content Area : Math
Goal Source : Continuous Improvement
Development Status : Approved

Student Goal Statement : All Defer students will demonstrate improved Math skills.

Gap Statement : Math was identified as a goal area based on a review of disaggregated data from a variety of sources:
-MEAP Math scores for Gr. 3 have increased and remained stable and high the last four years:
05-06 = 86% (first year of test)
06-07 = 97%
07-08 = 97%
08-09 = 96%
09-10 = 97% (District avg. = 95%)
>Males scored slightly higher than Females in 2008-09(98% vs. 94%), while in 2009-10 they both scored at 100% proficient. The District average was 98% for Males vs. 97% for Females.
>African-American students scored lower than Caucasian students in 2008-09 (86% vs. 100%), but both groups scored at 100% in 2009-10. The District average for 2009-10 was 90% for African-Americans and 99% for Caucasians.
>Econ. Disadvantaged students scored below Non-Econ. Disadv. students (82% vs. 98%) in 2008-09, but there were not enough students in that sub-group at Defer to get an average score for 2009-10.
-MEAP Math scores for Gr. 4 have been relatively high and stable:
02-03 = 83%
03-04 = 91%
04-05 = 81%
05-06 = 94%
06-07 = 91%
07-08 = 94%
08-09 = 94%
09-10 = 93% (District avg. = 97%)
>Males scored higher than Females in 2008-09 (96% vs. 92%) and just slightly higer in 2009-10 (93% vs. 92%). The District average was 97% vs. 98%.
>African-American students scored lower than Caucasian students (84% vs. 98%) in 2008-09, and even lower in 2009-10 (72% vs. 98%). The District comparison for 2009-10 was 87% vs. 99%.
>Econ. Disadvantaged students scored below Non-Econ. Disadv. students (71% vs. 99%) in 2008-09, and again in 2009-10 (80% vs. 95%). The District average for 2009-10 was 92% vs. 98%.
-MEAP Math scores for Gr. 5 have been relatively high, but still below desired levels:

05-06 = 84% (first year of test)
06-07 = 93%
07-08 = 87%
08-09 = 87%
09-10 = 91% (District avg. = 93%)
>Males scored only slightly lower than Females in 2008-09 (87% vs. 88%) and in 2009-10 (90% vs. 92%). The District comparison for 2009-10 was 93% for Males vs. 94% for Females.
>African-American students scored lower than Caucasian students (73% vs. 94%) in 2008-09, and similarly in 2009-10 (74% vs. 97%). The District average for 2009-10 was 81% vs. 95%.
>Econ. Disadvantaged students scored below Non-Econ. Disadv. students (65% vs. 93%) in 2008-09, and somewhat better in 2009-10 (72% vs. 96%). The District comparison for 2009-10 was 77% vs. 95%.

-NWEA Math averages for Spring 2009-10 for the sub-groups are not yet available. The scores below are based on the Spring 2008-09 averages:
-NWEA Math scores for Gr. 1: avg. %ile = 72.2%; the District avg. was 68.4%.
>Males scored higher than Females (74.2% vs. 69.8%); District avg. = 69.7% Vs. 67.1%.
-NWEA Math scores for Gr. 2: avg. %ile = 62.4%; the District avg. was 63.2%.
>Males scored higher than Females (68.8% vs. 53.9%); District avg. = 64.4% vs. 61.8%.
-NWEA Math scores for Gr. 3: avg. %ile = 63.4%; the District avg. was 61.9%.
>Males scored higher than Females (64.2% vs. 62.3%); District avg. = 64.5% vs. 58.9%.
-NWEA Math scores for Gr. 4: avg. %ile = 69.8%; the District avg. was 65.3%.
>Males scored higher than Females (71.2% vs. 67.9%); District avg. = 68.6% vs. 61.3%.
-NWEA Math scores for Gr. 5: avg. %ile = 61.6%; the District avg. was 63.2%.
>Males scored higher than Females (64.3% vs. 57.5%); District avg. = 63.3% vs. 63.1%.

Cause for Gap : On the assessments, specific sub-groups scored lower than the overall grade level populations.

Multiple measures/sources of data you used to identify this gap in student achievement : MEAP Math
NWEA-MAP Math Assessment
Everyday Math end-of-year assessment (future)
5th Grade end-of-year Middle School Math assessment
FASTT Math (future)

What are the criteria for success and what data or multiple measures of assessment will be used to monitor progress and success of this goal? -Increase in percentage of students who Meet or Exceed (Level 1 & 2) the MI standards on the MEAP Math Test in Gr. 3-5.

-Decrease the gap between sub-groups and the general population of students on the MEAP Math Test in Gr. 3-5 and on the NWEA-MAP Math test in Gr. 1-5:
>Decrease the gap in math achievement between male and female students.
>Increase the percentage of African-American students scoring at the Meet or Exceeds level on the MEAP and increase the average percentile score for these students on the NWEA-MAP.
>Increase the percentage of Economically-Disadvantaged students scoring at the Meet or Exceeds level on the MEAP and increase the average percentile score for these students on the NWEA-MAP.

-Benchmarks (Periodic):
>Grade level common assessments for each chapter through Everyday Math program

Goal Progress Update:

Date	User	Progress Status	Explanation of Progress Status
08/10/2009	ron.wardie@gpschools.org	In Progress	This goal is currently In Progress.

Contact Name : Ron Wardie

List of Objectives:

ID	Objective
5032	A range of 60 to 90 minutes will be devoted to math curriculum instruction each day.

1.1. Objective: Frequency of Instruction

Measurable Objective Statement to Support Goal : A range of 60 to 90 minutes will be devoted to math curriculum instruction each day.

Objective Progress Update:

Date	User	Progress Status	Explanation of Progress Status
08/10/2009	ron.wardie@gpschools.org	In Progress	Progress Status changed from Open to In Progress

List of Strategies:

ID	Strategy	Locked By
5032	The instructional time for math may be divided throughout the day. For example, there may be 15 minutes of review/problem solving at the beginning of the day and the scheduled math lesson may be taught at a later time. Student homework will be provided regularly to reinforce concepts and skills.	

1.1.1. Strategy: Instructional Time

Strategy Statement: The instructional time for math may be divided throughout the day. For example, there may be 15 minutes of review/problem solving at the beginning of the day and the scheduled math lesson may be taught at a later time.

Student homework will be provided regularly to reinforce concepts and skills.

Selected Target Areas

SPR (90) I.1.B.2 Students: The school makes a concerted effort to assure that all students have a clear understanding of what they are studying and why they are studying it.
SPR (90) I.2.B.3 Student Engagement: School staff believe that active student engagement is a key feature of their school and there is an expectation that all teachers at the school will design lessons and assessments that engage their students.
SPR (90) II.3.A.4 Time: Decisions regarding the allocation of instructional time and planning time are data-driven and focused on the attainment of school goals. School leaders develop the weekly schedule with a high priority placed on collaborative team planning time within the school day.

Other Required Information for Strategy

What research did you review to support the use of this strategy and action plan?
Information provided from a district curriculum committee review of teacher time devoted to math instruction.
Review research on best practices.
Everyday Math program pacing guidelines.

Strategy Progress Update:

Date	User	Progress Status	Explanation of Progress Status
08/10/2009	ron.wardie@gpschools.org	In Progress	Progress Status changed from Open to In Progress

List of Activities:

Activity	Begin Date	End Date	Staff Responsible
An instructional pacing guide for the Everyday Math program will be provided to teachers at all grade levels (Gr. 1-5).	09/08/2009	06/17/2010	Administration and Math Curriculum Specialists will provide the pacing guide. Classroom teachers will implement daily math instruction following the pacing guide.
Professional development to support improved math instruction and skills.	09/07/2010	06/16/2011	Principal District K-12 Math Curriculum Specialist(s) Grade Level Math Leaders Everyday Math consultant Assistant Supt. for Curriculum, Instruction & Assessment

1.1.1.1. Activity: Instructional Pacing Guide

Activity Description: An instructional pacing guide for the Everyday Math program will be provided to teachers at all grade levels (Gr. 1-5).

Activity Type: Maintenance

Planned staff responsible for implementing activity: Administration and Math Curriculum Specialists will provide the pacing guide.
Classroom teachers will implement daily math instruction following the pacing guide.

Actual staff responsible for implementing activity: Administrator
Math Curriculum Specialist
Classroom teachers

Planned Timeline: Begin Date - 09/08/2009, End Date - 06/17/2010

Actual Timeline: Begin Date - N/A, End Date - N/A

Fiscal Resources Needed for Activity:

Resource	Funding Source	Planned Amount	Actual Amount
Everyday Math materials	General Funds	1,300.00	0.00

Activity Progress Update:

Date	User	Progress Status	Explanation of Progress Status
08/10/2009	ron.wardie@gpschools.org	In Progress	Progress Status changed from Open to In Progress

1.1.1.2. Activity: Professional development to support improved math instructional and skills.

Activity Description: Professional development to support improved math instruction and skills.

Activity Type: Maintenance

Planned staff responsible for implementing activity: Principal
District K-12 Math Curriculum Specialist(s)
Grade Level Math Leaders
Everyday Math consultant
Assistant Supt. for Curriculum, Instruction & Assessment

Actual staff responsible for implementing activity:

Planned Timeline: Begin Date - 09/07/2010, End Date - 06/16/2011

Actual Timeline: Begin Date - N/A, End Date - N/A

Fiscal Resources Needed for Activity:

Resource	Funding Source	Planned Amount	Actual Amount
Professional Development funds	General Funds	500.00	0.00
Professional Development funds	Title I Part A	200.00	0.00
Professional Development funds	Title II Part D	250.00	0.00

Activity Progress Update:

Date	User	Progress Status	Explanation of Progress Status
08/10/2009	ron.wardie@gpschools.org	In Progress	Progress Status changed from Open to In Progress

Goal 2: Improved Reading Skills

Content Area : English Language Arts
Goal Source : Continuous Improvement
Development Status : Approved

Student Goal Statement : All Defer students will improve their skills in Reading.

Gap Statement : Reading was identified as a goal area based on a review of disaggregated data from two main sources:
-MEAP Reading scores for Gr. 3 have been relatively stable:
05-06 = 96%
06-07 = 97%
07-08 = 96%
08-09 = 93%
09-10 = 97%
>Males have typically scored slightly below Females each year. In 2009-2010, Males and Femals scored at the same level = 97%.
>African-American students scored below Caucasian students in 09-10: 92% vs. 100%.
>Economically-Disadvantaged students scored below Non-Economically Disadvanted students in 08-09: 73% vs. 97%, and about the same as the district avg.: Defer = 73% vs. District = 74%. The number of SED students in 09-10 was too low to record.
-MEAP Reading scores for Gr. 4 have been high during the past four years, but fluctuating:
05-06 = 94%
06-07 = 96%
07-08 = 98%
08-09 = 94%
09-10 = 91%
>Scores for Males and Females have fluctated each year. In 09-10, Males scored just slightly below Females: 91& for Males, 92% for Females.
>African-American students scored below Caucasian students in 09-10: 74% vs. 97%.
>Economically-Disadvantaged students scored below Non-Economically Disadvanted students in 09-10: 80% vs.

94%.

-MEAP Reading scores for Gr. 5 have been high, but fluctuating:

05-06 = 90%

06-07 = 95%

07-08 = 94%

08-09 = 95%

09-10 = 91%

>Scores for Males and Females have fluctated from year to year. In 09-10, Males scored 90% while Females were at 92%. The District comparison was 95% for Males vs. 97% for Females.

>African-American students scored below Caucasian students in 09-10: 83% vs. 93%. The District comparison was 81% vs. 98%.

>Economically-Disadvantaged students scored below Non-Economically Disadvanted students in 09-10 (72% vs. 96%), while the District avg. was 75% vs. 98%.

-Averages for the Spring 2009-2010 NWEA-MAP Reading Test are not yet available. The scores below are for Spring 2008-09:

-NWEA Reading scores for Gr. 1: avg. %ile = 73.1%; the District avg. was 66.9%.

>Males scored lower than Females (71.3% vs. 75.2%); District avg. = 65.0% Vs. 68.8%.

-NWEA Reading scores for Gr. 2: avg. %ile = 62.5%; the District avg. was 58.0%.

>Males scored slightly higher than Females (62.7% vs. 62.1%); District avg. = 55.0% vs. 661.6%.

-NWEA Reading scores for Gr. 3: avg. %ile = 65.3%; the District avg. was 60.9%.

>Males scored lower than Females (60.1% vs. 71.9%); District avg. = 59.7% vs. 62.3%.

-NWEA Reading scores for Gr. 4: avg. %ile = 64.9%; the District avg. was 65.9%.

>Males scored higher than Females (66.7% vs. 62.4%); District avg. = 65.9% for both Males and Females.

-NWEA Reading scores for Gr. 5: avg. %ile = 66.8; the District avg. was 67.8%.

>Males scored lower than Females (65.9% vs. 68.2%); District avg. = 64.7% vs. 71.1%.

Cause for Gap : On the assessments, specific sub-groups scored lower than the overall grade level populations.

Multiple measures/sources of data you used to identify this gap in student achievement : MEAP Reading test

NWEA-MAP Reading test

Houghton-Mifflin chapter tests (Gr. 1-3)

Classroom literature-based assessments (Gr. 4-5)

What are the criteria for success and what data or multiple measures of assessment will be used to monitor progress and success of this goal? -Increase the percentage of all students scoring at Levels 1 and 2 on the MEAP Reading Test in Grades 3-5.

-Decrease the gap between sub-groups and the general population of students on the MEAP Reading Test in Gr. 3-5 and on the NWEA-MAP Reading Test in Gr. 1-5.

>Decrease the gap in reading achievement between male and female students.

>Increase the percentage of African-American students scoring at Meets or Exceeds level on the MEAP Reading test and increase the average percentile score for these students on the NWEA-MAP Reading test.

>Increase the percentage of Economically-Disadvantaged students scoring at Meets or Exceeds level on the MEAP Reading test and increase the average percentile score for these students on the NWEA-MAP Reading test.

-Benchmarks (Perodic):

>Grade level common assessments for Grades 1-5.

Goal Progress Update:

Date	User	Progress Status	Explanation of Progress Status
08/10/2009	ron.wardie@gpschools.org	In Progress	Progress Status changed from Open to In Progress

Contact Name : Ron Wardie

List of Objectives:

ID	Objective
5889	Teachers will provide a 90-minute block of daily instructional time for Language Arts, including Reading.
15893	Teachers will use instructional strategies for Reading focus areas for each grade level.

2.1. Objective: Teachers will provide a 90-minute block of instructional time for L.Arts

Measurable Objective Statement to Support Goal : Teachers will provide a 90-minute block of daily instructional time for Language Arts, including Reading.

List of Strategies:

ID	Strategy	Locked By
5889	The Language Arts instructional time will be provided across the curriculum throughout the school day. Instructional time for Reading will provide for whole group instruction. Instructional time for Reading will provide for small group and individualized instruction. Instructional time for Reading will allow for independent reading for pleasure and practice.	

2.1.1. Strategy: Instructional Time

Strategy Statement: The Language Arts instructional time will be provided across the curriculum throughout the school day. Instructional time for Reading will provide for whole group instruction. Instructional time for Reading will provide for small group and individualized instruction. Instructional time for Reading will allow for independent reading for pleasure and practice.

Selected Target Areas

Other Required Information for Strategy

What research did you review to support the use of this strategy and action plan?
The District K-12 Language Arts Curriculum Committee researched best practices in the teaching of reading. The Committee reviewed available instructional resources (including basal reader programs) to support the adopted curriculum. The Committee conducted a new curriculum review during the 2009-10 school year.

List of Activities:

Activity	Begin Date	End Date	Staff Responsible
Teachers will use the instructional resources as adopted by the district: -Grade K-3 will use the Houghton-Mifflin reading materials. -Grades 4-5 will use sets of books from the approved reading list of materials. Teachers will also use other adopted and approved support materials as necessary to differentiate instruction for their students, such as leveled-readers, Wright Group materials, Wordly Wise, FAST Reading materials, etc.	09/07/2010	06/16/2011	Principal, District Language Arts Specialist(s), Grade Level Language Arts Leaders, Assistant Supt. for Curriculum, Instruction, Assessment and Technology
Teachers will be provided professional learning opportunities to further enhance their reading instructional strategies throughout the school year. Teachers will meet by grade level teams during common planning times and during PLC sessions with the focus on improving student reading skills. Grade level teams will also meet during IBM's (Inter-Building Meetings) for the purpose of discussing and improving their instructional skills for reading as well as for reviewing various reading materials. Time will be provided as necessary during specific building Site Meetings for data analysis.	09/07/2010	06/16/2011	Principal, K-12 Language Arts Curriculum Specialist(s), Grade Level Language Arts Leaders, Assistant Supt. for Curriculum, Instruction, Assessment and Technology

2.1.1.1. Activity: Use of adopted instructional resources

Activity Description: Teachers will use the instructional resources as adopted by the district:
-Grade K-3 will use the Houghton-Mifflin reading materials.
-Grades 4-5 will use sets of books from the approved reading list of materials.

Teachers will also use other adopted and approved support materials as necessary to differentiate instruction for their students, such as leveled-readers, Wright Group materials, Wordly Wise, FAST Reading materials, etc.

Activity Type: Maintenance

Planned staff responsible for implementing activity: Principal,
District Language Arts Specialist(s),
Grade Level Language Arts Leaders,
Assistant Supt. for Curriculum, Instruction, Assessment and Technology

Actual staff responsible for implementing activity:

Planned Timeline: Begin Date - 09/07/2010, End Date - 06/16/2011

Actual Timeline: Begin Date - N/A, End Date - N/A

Fiscal Resources Needed for Activity:

Resource	Funding Source	Planned Amount	Actual Amount
Instructional Materials funding	General Funds	1,000.00	0.00
Instructional Materials funding	Title I Part A	250.00	0.00

2.1.1.2. Activity: Professional development to support improved reading skills.

Activity Description: Teachers will be provided professional learning opportunities to further enhance their reading instructional strategies throughout the school year. Teachers will meet by grade level teams during common planning times and during PLC sessions with the focus on improving student reading skills. Grade level teams will also meet during IBM's (Inter-Building Meetings) for the purpose of discussing and improving their instructional skills for reading as well as for reviewing various reading materials. Time will be provided as necessary during specific building Site Meetings for data analysis.

Activity Type: Maintenance

Planned staff responsible for implementing activity: Principal,
K-12 Language Arts Curriculum Specialist(s),
Grade Level Language Arts Leaders,
Assistant Supt. for Curriculum, Instruction, Assessment and Technology

Actual staff responsible for implementing activity:

Planned Timeline: Begin Date - 09/07/2010, End Date - 06/16/2011

Actual Timeline: Begin Date - N/A, End Date - N/A

Fiscal Resources Needed for Activity:

Resource	Funding Source	Planned Amount	Actual Amount
Professional Development funding	General Funds	500.00	0.00

| Professional Development funding | Title I Part A | 500.00 | 0.00 |

2.2. Objective: Instructional Strategies for Reading

Measurable Objective Statement to Support Goal : Teachers will use instructional strategies for Reading focus areas for each grade level.

List of Strategies:

ID	Strategy	Locked By
15893	Strategies will include (but not limited to): word study lessons, making words lessons, common grade level questions, Reading Workshop, and making inferences.	

2.2.1. Strategy: Instructional Strategies for Reading

Strategy Statement: Strategies will include (but not limited to): word study lessons, making words lessons, common grade level questions, Reading Workshop, and making inferences.

Selected Target Areas

SPR (90) I.2.A.2 Developmental Appropriateness: Instructional planning is focused upon ensuring student success. Instructional practice is designed around the needs, interests and aptitudes of the individual students. The result is a curriculum that allows students to derive meaning from all of their educational experiences.

SPR (90) I.2.B.1 Delivered Curriculum: The school or program ensures that students have the supports they need to meet the required standards. Teachers provide opportunities for students to use many and varied approaches to demonstrate competency. The school or program continuously adapts curriculum, instruction, and assessments to meet its students' diverse and changing needs.

SPR (90) I.2.B.2 Best Practice: There is a strong belief within the school or program that all students can succeed. This is demonstrated in the expanded use at both the school or program and classroom levels of a variety of best practices designed to meet the differentiated needs of individual learners. Technology is a key component of instructional practice.

SPR (90) I.3.B.3 Meets Student Needs: All stakeholders are committed to the belief that all student learners will be successful. In order to achieve this goal, students play a major role in monitoring and improving their own performance. Student achievement is truly a joint venture among student, teacher, and parent. In order to ensure success of all students, a school-wide or cross-program system is in place that monitors the progress of any student not succeeding and provides data to all stakeholders to inform them about resulting interventions.

Other Required Information for Strategy

What research did you review to support the use of this strategy and action plan?

The instructional staff analyzed student assessment data to determine specific areas of focus for Reading instruction for each grade level. They also reviewed various instructional strategies based on the adopted curriculum and instructional materials, such as the Houghton-Mifflin reading series and other district documents.

List of Activities:

Activity	Begin Date	End Date	Staff Responsible
Teachers will provide differentiated Reading instruction to address the key focus areas for each grade level as determined by the School Improvement Team and the individual grade level PLC teams. The strategies used by each grade level will be developmentally appropriate for that grade level and will be based on best practices in reading instruction, including those identified through the District curriculum and instructional materials documents.	09/07/2010	06/16/2011	Principal, Language Arts Curriculum Specialist(s), Classroom Teachers, Assistant Superintendent for Curriculum, Instruction, Assessment, and Technology

2.2.1.1. Activity: Differentiated Reading Instruction

Activity Description: Teachers will provide differentiated Reading instruction to address the key focus areas for each grade level as determined by the School Improvement Team and the individual grade level PLC teams. The strategies used by each grade level will be developmentally appropriate for that grade level and will be based on best practices in reading instruction, including those identified through the District curriculum and instructional materials documents.

Activity Type: None

Planned staff responsible for implementing activity: Principal,
Language Arts Curriculum Specialist(s),
Classroom Teachers,
Assistant Superintendent for Curriculum, Instruction, Assessment, and Technology

Actual staff responsible for implementing activity:

Planned Timeline: Begin Date - 09/07/2010, End Date - 06/16/2011

Actual Timeline: Begin Date - N/A, End Date - N/A

Fiscal Resources Needed for Activity:

Resource	Funding Source	Planned Amount	Actual Amount
Supplemental Instructional Resources	General Funds	500.00	0.00

Goal 3: Improved Writing Skills

Content Area : English Language Arts
Goal Source : Continuous Improvement
Development Status : Approved

Student Goal Statement : All Defer students will demonstrate improved writing skills.

Gap Statement : Based on a review of disaggregated data from a variety of sources, writing was identified as a goal area:
-GP Writing scores for Gr. 1 & 2 have remained consistently high since 2002-03, however Gr. 1 showed a slight decrease in 08-09 and Gr. 2 showed a larger decrease in 08-09: (Note: Data is not yet available for the 2009-2010 school year)
>Gr. 1:
02-03 = 88.9% at grade level
03-04 = 86.8%
04-05 = 94.1%
05-06 = 94.7%
06-07 = 95.7%
07-08 = 95.7%
08-09 = 92.5% (District avg. = 93.5%)
09-10 = Not Available yet
>Gr. 2:
02-03 = 82.6% at grade level
03-04 = 92.1%
04-05 = 95.4%
05-06 = 96.9%
06-07 = 93.9%
07-08 = 94.9%
08-09 = 89.3% (District avg. = 93.3%)
09-10 = Not Available yet
-GP Writing scores for Gr. 3 &4 have fluctuated since 2002-03; there was a significant decrease from 06-07 to 07-08, but then we had a slight increase in 08-09 for Gr. 3, but Gr. 4 showed a slight decrease. (Note: Data is not yet available for the 2009-2010 school year)
>Gr. 3:
02-03 = 65.0% at grade level
03-04 = 49.4%
04-05 = 71.6%
05-06 = 66.3%
06-07 = 72.8%
07-08 = 61.4%
08-09 = 62.7% (District avg. = 60.7%)
09-10 = Not Available yet
>Gr. 4:
02-03 = 64.5%
03-04 = 63.5%
04-05 = 54.9%
05-06 = 68.9%
06-07 = 65.0%

07-08 = 52.5%
08-09 = 48.8% (District avg. = 59.2%)
09-10 = Not Available yet
-GP Writing scores for Gr. 5 have declined from 2002-03 to 2005-06, but there have been steady increases from 05-06 to 08-09. (Note: Data is not yet available for the 2009-2010 school year)
>Gr. 5:
02-03 = 74.3%
03-04 = 84.5%
04-05 = 52.1%
05-06 = 45.1%
06-07 = 54.5%
07-08 = 58.4%
08-09 = 62.2% (District avg. = 66.3%)
09-10 = Not Available yet
-MEAP Writing scores for Gr. 3 have increased since 2005-06 (first year of testing), but well below desired levels. (Note: MEAP Writing was discontinued for Gr. 3 in 09-10)
05-06 = 67%
06-07 = 78%
07-08 = 77%
08-09 = 84% (District avg. = 73%)
09-10 = NA
-MEAP Writing scores for Gr. 4 have fluctuated since 2002-03, but have shown steady improvement since 2006-07. (Note: MEAP Writing was only a pilot for Gr. 4 in 09-10)
02-03 = 62%
03-04 = 66%
04-05 = 48%
05-06 = 81%
06-07 = 64%
07-08 = 68%
08-09 = 74% (District avg. = 69%)
09-10 = NA
-MEAP Writing scores for Gr. 5 have remained steady, but below desired levels since 2005-06 (first year of testing). There was an increase in 2008-09. (Note: MEAP Writing was discontinued for Gr. 5 in 2009-10)
05-06 = 80%
06-07 = 80%
07-08 = 80%
08-09 = 85% (District avg. = 81%)
09-10 = NA
-Males typically scored below females at all 3 grade levels (Gr. 3-5) on the MEAP Writing test and on the GP Writing test. However, for 2008-09 on the MEAP, only Gr. 4 showed a significant discrepency. Defer scored quite well above the District average for all Males and Females on the 2008-09 MEAP Writing test except for the Gr. 5 Females. Whereas on the GPWA, Defer Males and Females scored below the District average for all grades except for Gr. 3.
MEAP Writing for 2008-09:
Gr. 3 M = 83% F = 85% (District avg. is M = 69% F = 77%)
Gr. 4 M = 69% F = 81% (District avg. is M = 62% F = 76%)
Gr. 5 M = 84% F = 85% (District avg. is M = 75% F = 87%)

GPWA for 2008-09:
Gr. 1 M = 91.9% F = 93.3% (District avg. is M = 90.5% F = 96.5%)

Gr. 2 M = 90.7% F = 87.5% (District avg. is M = 90.9% F = 96.2%)
Gr. 3 M = 57.1% F = 69.7% (District avg. is M = 55.6% F = 66.5%)
Gr. 4 M = 43.8% F = 55.6% (District avg. is M = 53.2% F = 66.3%)
Gr. 5 M = 57.1% F = 69.7% (District avg. is M = 58.0% F = 75.3%)
-Our sub-groups typically score well below our majority of students on the MEAP Writing test (results are from 08-09):
>African-American compared to Caucasian: Gr. 3 (64% vs. 91%); Gr. 4 (42% vs. 84%); Gr. 5 (77% vs. 90%). However, African-American students at Defer scored significantly above students in that sub-group district-wide at Gr. 3 and 5: Gr. 3 (64% vs. 35%); Gr. 5 (77% vs. 57%), and at the district-wide level for Gr. 4: Gr. 4 (42% vs. 41%).
>Econ. Disadvantaged students scored below Non-Econ. Disadvantaged: Gr. 3 (55% vs. 89%); Gr. 4 (29% vs. 83%); Gr. 5 (59% vs. 92%). However, Econ. Disadvantage students at Defer scored at or above students in that sub-group district-wide: Gr. 3 (55% vs. 41%); Gr. 4 (29% vs. 27%); Gr. 5 (59% vs. 55%)
>Students With Disabilities vs. Non-Disabled Students: scores are typically about 3% less for Students With Disabilities for Gr. 3-5 than for Non-Disabled Students.
-Comment Codes from the 2008-09 MEAP indicate that our students' greatest needs for improvement are (in rank order):
Gr. 3:
1. lacks coherent organization and/or connections between ideas
2. needs details and examples to adequately develop the ideas and content
3. needs richer development of the central idea with some additional, relevant details and examples to get a higher score
Gr. 4:
1. needs richer development of the central idea with some additional, relevant details and examples to get a higher score
2. needs details and examples to adequately develop the ideas and content
3. lacks coherent organization and/or connections between ideas
4. Needs greater precision and maturity of language use to get a higher score
Gr. 5:
1. needs details and examples to adequately develop the ideas and content
2. needs richer development of the central idea with some additional, relevant details and examples to get a higher score
3. Needs greater precision and maturity of language use to get a higher score
4. Lacks focus on one central idea
-Domains of Writing: Writing Process and Writing Genres were the two lowest domains for Gr. 3-5

Cause for Gap : On the MEAP Writing and the GP Writing Assessment, specific subgroups of students scored lower than the overall grade level populations.

Multiple measures/sources of data you used to identify this gap in student achievement : -MEAP Writing (Gr. 3-5) prior to 2009-10, including Comment and Condition Codes
-GP Writing Assessment (Gr. 1-5)
-Teacher input based on daily and periodic student writing samples

What are the criteria for success and what data or multiple measures of assessment will be used to monitor progress and success of this goal? -Increase the percentage of students who Meet or Exceed (Level 1 or 2) the Michigan Standards on the MEAP Writing Test in Grade 4 for 2010-2011. (Note: Starting in 2010-2011, the MEAP Writing Test will only be given at Gr. 4).
-Increase the percentage of students performing at grade level expectations or above on the GP Writing Assessment in Grades 1-5.

-Decrease the gap between sub-groups and the general population (Males/Females; African-Amercian/Caucasian; Economically Disadvantaged/Non-Economically Disadvantaged).
-The measures of success will be: MEAP Writing (Gr. 4), including Comment and Condition Codes and the GP Writing Assessment (Gr. 1-5)

Goal Progress Update:

Date	User	Progress Status	Explanation of Progress Status
08/10/2009	ron.wardie@gpschools.org	In Progress	Progress Status changed from Open to In Progress

Contact Name : Ron Wardie

List of Objectives:

ID	Objective
5053	Classroom teachers will provide a 45-minute block of time daily devoted to writing instruction.
15164	Classroom teachers will design specific lessons with provisions for differentiation using best pract
15166	Classroom teachers will continue to expand their knowledge and use of Writers' Workshop.

3.1. Objective: Frequency of Instruction

Measurable Objective Statement to Support Goal : Classroom teachers will provide a 45-minute block of time daily devoted to writing instruction.

Objective Progress Update:

Date	User	Progress Status	Explanation of Progress Status
08/10/2009	ron.wardie@gpschools.org	In Progress	Progress Status changed from Open to In Progress

List of Strategies:

ID	Strategy	Locked By
5053	The 45-minute writing block can take any form (e.g., 10 minute mini-lesson, 30 minutes to write while conferencing with students, and 5 minute wrap-up).	

3.1.1. Strategy: Instructional Time

Strategy Statement: The 45-minute writing block can take any form (e.g., 10 minute mini-lesson, 30 minutes to write while conferencing with students, and 5 minute wrap-up).

Selected Target Areas

SPR (90) I.1.A.1 Curriculum Document(s): The curriculum documents are the basic framework for instruction. They contain essential and rigorous content that guides what is taught within and across grade levels. They provide consistency and continuity to the curriculum and instruction practiced at the school and reflects the belief that all students should actively construct and apply knowledge.

SPR (90) I.1.A.5 Inclusive: The curriculum is sufficiently flexible to allow for adaptation and modification to meet the wide range of needs and abilities of all students.

SPR (90) I.1.B.1 Staff: Communication and articulation about the curriculum is a high priority for the entire staff. A dialog is promoted between and across grade levels and content areas. Particular emphasis is paid to the curriculum dialog of teachers from one instructional level to another.

SPR (90) I.1.B.2 Students: The school makes a concerted effort to ensure that all students have a clear understanding of what they are studying and why they are studying it.

SPR (90) I.2.A.2 Developmental Appropriateness: Instructional planning is focused upon ensuring student success. Instructional practice is designed around the needs, interests and aptitudes of the individual students. The result is a curriculum that allows students to derive meaning from all of their educational experiences.

SPR (90) I.2.B.2 Best Practice: There is a strong belief within the school or program that all students can succeed. This is demonstrated in the expanded use at both the school or program and classroom levels of a variety of best practices designed to meet the differentiated needs of individual learners. Technology is a key component of instructional practice.

SPR (90) I.2.B.3 Student Engagement: Staff believe that active student engagement is a key feature of student success and there is an expectation that all teachers will design lessons and assessments that engage their students.

SPR (90) I.3.B.1 Reporting: The school believes in open communication about student achievement. Assessment results based upon the Content Expectations (GLCE, HSCE) or Michigan Curriculum Framework (where appropriate) are provided to teachers, students, and parents. The results are kept current so that staff members can use them to inform instruction and to work with students to increase proficiency. Parents and students have the opportunity to meet with staff for the purpose of clarifying the information and planning for the future.

SPR (90) II.1.A.3 Technology: School leaders recognize that technology is essential to the school's success. They seek the necessary resources to support the integration and effective use of technology in all aspects of curriculum, instruction and assessment.

SPR (90) II.3.A.4 Time: Decisions regarding the allocation of instructional time and planning time are data-driven and focused on the attainment of school goals. School leaders place a high priority on collaborative team planning time within the school day.

Other Required Information for Strategy

What research did you review to support the use of this strategy and action plan?
The District Language Arts Committee researched best practices for quality writing instruction.
Grosse Pointe Writing Assessment and MEAP Writing data were reviewed and analyzed.

Strategy Progress Update:

Date	User	Progress Status	Explanation of Progress Status
08/10/2009	ron.wardie@gpschools.org	In Progress	Progress Status changed from Open to In Progress

List of Activities:

Activity	Begin Date	End Date	Staff Responsible
Students will be involved in daily writing activities. Students will demonstrate writing growth via scheduled assessment practice sessions throughout the year. Students will receive detailed and meaningful feedback in response to their writing efforts individually and via whole-group.	09/07/2010	06/16/2011	Administration Curriculum Specialists Classroom Teachers
Teachers will be provided opportunities for further professional learning regarding best practices in writing instruction throughout the school year. Such topics as 6 + 1 Traits, Writer's Workshop, student conferencing, and data analysis will be the focus. Teachers will meet by grade levels during common planning times and during PLC sessions with the focus on student writing, especially scoring of student writing and data analysis. Time will be provided during PLC sessions and specific Building Site Meetings to analyze student data and to collaborate regarding best practices for writing instruction. District-wide learning opportunities and collaboration will take place during in-service days and Inter-Building Meetings (IBM) per the master calendar. Other district workshops and professional learning activities may be provided.	09/07/2010	06/16/2011	Grade level teachers will plan their common planning time and PLC activities, focused on student writing. The principal and School Improvement Team will determine specific activities for Site Meetings. The district Language Arts Curriculum Specialist(s) with input from the building principals, Grade Level Leaders, and the Assistant Superintendent for Curriculum, Instruction and Assessment will determine the district-wide in-service and staff development needs of teachers at each grade level for the coming school year.

3.1.1.1. Activity: Frequent Writing with Meaningful Feedback

Activity Description: Students will be involved in daily writing activities.
Students will demonstrate writing growth via scheduled assessment practice sessions throughout the year.
Students will receive detailed and meaningful feedback in response to their writing efforts individually and via whole-group.

Activity Type: Maintenance

Planned staff responsible for implementing activity: Administration
Curriculum Specialists
Classroom Teachers

Actual staff responsible for implementing activity:

Planned Timeline: Begin Date - 09/07/2010, End Date - 06/16/2011

Actual Timeline: Begin Date - N/A, End Date - N/A

Fiscal Resources Needed for Activity:

Resource	Funding Source	Planned Amount	Actual Amount
Instructional Materials	General Funds	1,000.00	0.00

Activity Progress Update:

Date	User	Progress Status	Explanation of Progress Status
08/10/2009	ron.wardie@gpschools.org	In Progress	Progress Status changed from Open to In Progress

3.1.1.2. Activity: Staff Development in Writing Instruction

Activity Description: Teachers will be provided opportunities for further professional learning regarding best practices in writing instruction throughout the school year. Such topics as 6 + 1 Traits, Writer's Workshop, student conferencing, and data analysis will be the focus.

Teachers will meet by grade levels during common planning times and during PLC sessions with the focus on student writing, especially scoring of student writing and data analysis. Time will be provided during PLC sessions and specific Building Site Meetings to analyze student data and to collaborate regarding best practices for writing instruction. District-wide learning opportunities and collaboration will take place during in-service days and Inter-Building Meetings (IBM) per the master calendar. Other district workshops and professional learning activities may be provided.

Activity Type: Maintenance

Planned staff responsible for implementing activity: Grade level teachers will plan their common planning time and PLC activities, focused on student writing. The principal and School Improvement Team will determine specific activities for Site Meetings. The district Language Arts Curriculum Specialist(s) with input from the building principals, Grade Level Leaders, and the Assistant Superintendent for Curriculum, Instruction and Assessment will determine the district-wide in-service and staff development needs of teachers at each grade level for the coming school year.

Actual staff responsible for implementing activity:

Planned Timeline: Begin Date - 09/07/2010, End Date - 06/16/2011

Actual Timeline: Begin Date - N/A, End Date - N/A

Fiscal Resources Needed for Activity:

Resource	Funding Source	Planned Amount	Actual Amount
General Education Funds	General Funds	500.00	0.00
Title I Funding	Title I Part A	200.00	0.00
Title II Funding	Title II Part D	100.00	0.00

Activity Progress Update:

Date	User	Progress Status	Explanation of Progress Status
08/10/2009	ron.wardie@gpschools.org	In Progress	Progress Status changed from Open to In Progress

3.2. Objective: Writing Lesson Designs

Measurable Objective Statement to Support Goal : Classroom teachers will design specific lessons with provisions for differentiation using best pract

List of Strategies:

ID	Strategy	Locked By
15164	Classroom teachers will incorporate the 6 + 1 Writing Traits approaches within their writing lessons. Specific lessons will be focused on the various traits throughout the school year and across the grade levels as developmentally appropriate.	

3.2.1. Strategy: 6 + 1 Writing Traits

Strategy Statement: Classroom teachers will incorporate the 6 + 1 Writing Traits approaches within their writing lessons. Specific lessons will be focused on the various traits throughout the school year and across the grade levels as developmentally appropriate.

Selected Target Areas

SPR (90) I.1.A.5 Inclusive: The curriculum is sufficiently flexible to allow for adaptation and modification to meet the wide range of needs and abilities of all students.

SPR (90) I.1.B.2 Students: The school makes a concerted effort to ensure that all students have a clear understanding of what they are studying and why they are studying it.

SPR (90) I.2.A.2 Developmental Appropriateness: Instructional planning is focused upon ensuring student success. Instructional practice is designed around the needs, interests and aptitudes of the individual students. The result is a curriculum that allows students to derive meaning from all of their educational experiences.

SPR (90) I.2.A.3 Reflection and Refinement: A collaborative culture that incorporates a philosophy of continuous improvement exists at the school or within a program. Staff members work as teams to gather and analyze information and make decisions regarding the modification of their instructional practice.

SPR (90) I.2.B.2 Best Practice: There is a strong belief within the school or program that all students can succeed. This is demonstrated in the expanded use at both the school or program and classroom levels of a variety of best practices designed to meet the differentiated needs of individual learners. Technology is a key component of instructional practice.

SPR (90) I.2.B.3 Student Engagement: Staff believe that active student engagement is a key feature of student success and there is an expectation that all teachers will design lessons and assessments that engage their students.

SPR (90) I.3.A.1 Alignment/Content Validity: Assessments are aligned with the curriculum and instruction. They have been designed by matching the appropriate measurement method to the type of learning targets (knowledge, reasoning, skill, performance or disposition.)

SPR (90) V.2.A.1 Analysis: Staff is trained in and uses data analysis techniques that include consideration of such factors as multiple types of data, multiple sources, comparisons across groups, benchmarking and longitudinal data. The data system allows for efficient use and manipulation by collaborative teams.

Other Required Information for Strategy

What research did you review to support the use of this strategy and action plan?
The District Language Arts Committee researched best practices in writing
Defer classroom teachers have also researched best practices in writing

List of Activities:

Activity	Begin Date	End Date	Staff Responsible
Classroom teachers will provide specific lessons for student writing using the 6 + 1 Writing Traits. For example, the lower grade levels will focus heavily on ideas, organization and conventions in narrative writing while the upper grades will focus more heavily on conventions and voice in narrative writing and writing across the content areas.	09/07/2010	06/16/2011	Classroom Teachers

3.2.1.1. Activity: 6 + 1 Writing Traits

Activity Description: Classroom teachers will provide specific lessons for student writing using the 6 + 1 Writing Traits. For example, the lower grade levels will focus heavily on ideas, organization and conventions in narrative writing while the upper grades will focus more heavily on conventions and voice in narrative writing and writing across the content areas.

Activity Type: Maintenance

Planned staff responsible for implementing activity: Classroom Teachers

Actual staff responsible for implementing activity:

Planned Timeline: Begin Date - 09/07/2010, End Date - 06/16/2011

Actual Timeline: Begin Date - N/A, End Date - N/A

Fiscal Resources Needed for Activity:

Resource	Funding Source	Planned Amount	Actual Amount
Professional Learning in 6 1 Traits	General Funds	300.00	0.00

3.3. Objective: Writers' Workshop

Measurable Objective Statement to Support Goal : Classroom teachers will continue to expand their knowledge and use of Writers' Workshop.

List of Strategies:

ID	Strategy	Locked By
15166	Increased use of Writers' Workshop process; Practice GP Writing Assessment 3 times per year; Scoring of student writing samples using GPWA rubrics; Focus on details, conventions, and checklist for quality writing across the content areas; Focus on beginning, middle, end; Use of student writing samples for modeling, revising, and editing;	

3.3.1. Strategy: Writers' Workshop

Strategy Statement: Increased use of Writers' Workshop process;
Practice GP Writing Assessment 3 times per year;
Scoring of student writing samples using GPWA rubrics;
Focus on details, conventions, and checklist for quality writing across the content areas;
Focus on beginning, middle, end;
Use of student writing samples for modeling, revising, and editing;

Selected Target Areas

SPR (90) I.1.A.5 Inclusive: The curriculum is sufficiently flexible to allow for adaptation and modification to meet the wide range of needs and abilities of all students. SPR (90) I.2.B.1 Delivered Curriculum: The school or program ensures that students have the supports they need to meet the required standards. Teachers provide opportunities for students to use many and varied approaches to demonstrate competency. The school or program continuously adapts curriculum, instruction, and assessments to meet its students' diverse and changing needs. SPR (90) I.2.B.2 Best Practice: There is a strong belief within the school or program that all students can succeed. This is demonstrated in the expanded use at both the school or program and classroom levels of a variety of best practices designed to meet the differentiated needs of individual learners. Technology is a key component of instructional practice. SPR (90) I.3.B.3 Meets Student Needs: All stakeholders are committed to the belief that all student learners will be successful. In order to achieve this goal, students play a major role in monitoring and improving their own performance. Student achievement is truly a joint venture among student, teacher, and parent. In order to ensure success of all students, a school-wide or cross-program system is in place that monitors the progress of any student not succeeding and provides data to all stakeholders to inform them about resulting interventions.

Other Required Information for Strategy

What research did you review to support the use of this strategy and action plan?
Best practices in quality writing as researched by the GP Language Arts Committee
Writers' Workshop
Lucy Caulkins
GP Writing Assessment rubrics
FAST First Steps

List of Activities:

Activity	Begin Date	End Date	Staff Responsible
Classroom teachers will be provided opportunites to learn more about planning and implementing the Writers' Workshop model for instruction	09/07/2010	06/16/2011	District Curriculum Specialists District and Building Administration Grade Level Specialists Classroom Teachers

3.3.1.1. Activity: Writers' Workshop professional learning opportunities

Activity Description: Classroom teachers will be provided opportunites to learn more about planning and implementing the Writers' Workshop model for instruction

Activity Type: Revised

Planned staff responsible for implementing activity: District Curriculum Specialists
District and Building Administration
Grade Level Specialists
Classroom Teachers

Actual staff responsible for implementing activity:

Planned Timeline: Begin Date - 09/07/2010, End Date - 06/16/2011

Actual Timeline: Begin Date - N/A, End Date - N/A

Fiscal Resources Needed for Activity:

Resource	Funding Source	Planned Amount	Actual Amount
Writers' Workshop Professional Learning	General Funds	250.00	0.00

Resource Profile

Funding Source	Planned Amount	Actual Amount
General Funds	$5,850.00	$0.00
Title I Part A	$1,150.00	$0.00
Title II Part D	$350.00	$0.00

Title I Required Components

As part of the School Improvement Plan (SIP) submittal process for a given school year, each building receiving Title I funds is required to complete either a Title I Schoolwide Required Components or a Title I Targeted Assistance Required Components. The current status of the Title I Required Components is listed below. The SIP cannot be submitted until the Title I Required Components has a status of Submitted.

Report	Open Date	Due Date	Status
Required Components	12/02/2009	09/01/2010	Submitted

Stakeholders

List of names, positions and e-mail addresses of the stakeholders (staff, parents, community/business members and, as appropriate, students) who were involved in the planning, design, monitoring, and evaluation of this plan.

Title	First Name	Last Name	Position	E-mail
Mr.	Ron	Wardie	Principal	ron.wardie@gpschools.org
Mrs.	Janette	High	1st Grade Teacher	janette.high@gpschools.org
Mrs.	Nora	Hard	2nd Grade Teacher	nora.hard@gpschools.org
Mrs.	Heather	Halpin	2/3 Magnet Teacher	heather.halpin@gpschools.org
Mrs.	Megan	Brown	4th Grade Teacher	megan.brown@gpschools.org
Mrs.	Jennifer	Corbett	4/5 Magnet Teacher	jennifer.corbett@gpschools.org
Dr.	Dona	Johnson-Beach	School Psychologist	dona.johnson-beach@gpschools.org

1. Describe how all stakeholders are involved in the planning, design, monitoring and evaluation of this institution improvement plan.

A School Improvement Team (SIT) of representatives from each grade level met regularly to gather and analyze data and input from other staff members regarding the goals for the school improvement plan. Other support staff are also included. Parent input is also provided through the District's EPLC (Education Program Learning Committee) and through Defer's Title I Parent Advisory Committee as well as informally through PTO meetings, etc. Key assessment data is the driving force for all decisions related to student instruction and learning. The SIT designs the format for the plan and is responsible for monitoring and evaluating the success (results) of the plan.

2. Describe how decisions about curriculum, instruction and assessment are made at this institution, and how all stakeholders are involved in the process.

Teachers and parent representatives participate as members of the District EPLC to provide recommendations regarding curriculum, instruction, and assessment. Teachers also have multiple opportunities for input at building Site Meetings, Inter-Building Meetings, Department Meetings, Grade Level meetings, and as members of various K-12 Curriculum Review Committees. The Board of Education is ultimately responsible for making decisions about curriculum and curriculum materials, but it relies heavily on the professional judgment of the K-12 Curriculum Committees and the EPLC.

3. Describe how institution and student information and progress will be shared with all stakeholders in a language that they can understand.

A PA-25 Annual Report Meeting is held in the Fall of each year to update parents on the School Improvement Plan and the measures of student academic learning. Staff members are updated periodically at Building Site Meetings, IBM meetings, and various Professional Learning and other curriculum-related meeting opportunities.

Statement of Non-Discrimination

Federal Office for Civil Rights

The institution complies with all federal laws and regulations prohibiting discrimination and with all requirements and regulations of the U.S. Department of Education. It is the policy of this school that no person on the basis of race, color, religion, national origin or ancestry, age, gender, height, weight, marital status or disability shall be subjected to discrimination in any program, service or activity for which the district/school is responsible, or for which it receives financial assistance from the U.S. Department of Education.

Contact Information

Schools/Districts are required to designate an employee to coordinate efforts to comply with and carry out non-discrimination responsibilities.

Position of Contact:	Rose Mendola, Interim Co-Director of Student Services
Address:	Barnes School, 20090 Morningside, Grosse Pointe Woods, MI 48236
Telephone Number:	313-432-3854

References

- Title VI of the Civil Rights Act of 1964
- The Age Discrimination Act of 1975
- The Americans with Disabilities Act of 1990
- Elliott-Larsen prohibits discrimination against religion

Conclusion

1. What Professional Learning activities will you need to provide to support the successful implementation of this school improvement plan?

For Writing: On-going writing instructional strategies, such as 6 + 1 Traits, Writer's Workshop, and student conferencing; GP Writing Assessment data analysis; MEAP Writing data analysis

For Math: On-going professional learning activities for the new Everyday Math program and materials; grade level meetiings (IBM and within the building, in-services throughout the school year coordinated by the Math Curriculum Specialist, and conversations with the EM representative/specialist.

2. How has the institution integrated its available fiscal resources to support this school improvement plan?

Professional development funding is provided at the district level for IBM's and in-service opportunities for Writing and for EM. The district also provides opportunities for the staff to meet with the EM representative periodically for individual and small-group support. The district receives some grant money for staff develpment and for various writing and math materials.

The building funds for professional development come from 3 main sources: General Education funds provided by the district, Title I funds, and Title II funds.

3. How has the institution assessed the need for and integrated the use of technology to support this school improvement plan?

Technology use within the district has always been focused on integration of the technology as an instructional tool. This year, the district is providing digital cameras (Elmo's) and projection units for everyclassroom through a State of Michigan grant. We also have computers in every classroom for student and teacher use as well as a class-size Computer Lab. The State grant is also providing sets of lap-top computers this year to support our need for extra access to computer time. In addition, specific teachers have been awarded Smart Boards for their classrooms as part of the State grant, through a district application process.