

School Improvement Plan

School Year: 2010

School District: Dearborn City School District

Intermediate School District: Wayne RESA

School Name: Stout Middle School

Grades Served: 6,7,8

Principal: Ms. Julia Maconochie

Building Code: 04088

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	3
School Information	5
Vision	6
Goals	7
Goal 1: Reading Goal	7
Goal 2: Problem Solving	18
Goal 3: Communication: Written and Oral	26
Resource Profile	34
Title I Required Components	35
Stakeholders	36
Statement of Non-Discrimination	40
Conclusion	41

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:	Stout Middle School
District:	Dearborn City School District
Public/Non-Public:	Public
Grades:	6,7,8
School Code Number:	04088
City:	Dearborn
State/Province:	Michigan
Country:	United States

Vision

Vision Statement

Stout Middle School Vision

Our Hopes and Dreams.

We envision a school in which high levels of learning for all students and adults alike is achieved.

Mission Statement

Stout Middle School Mission

Our reason for being.

Our responsibility is to relentlessly pursue and ensure high levels of learning for all students and adults alike.

Beliefs Statement

Stout Middle School Values

We believe all students are capable of achieving high standards of Learning.

Goals

ID	Name	Development Status	Progress Status
2427	Reading Goal	Approved	In Progress
2428	Problem Solving	Approved	In Progress
2559	Communication: Written and Oral	Approved	In Progress

Goal 1: Reading Goal

Content Area : English Language Arts

Goal Source : Continuous Improvement

Development Status : Approved

Student Goal Statement : Reading Goal: Reading scores on the Michigan Education Assessment Program (M.E.A.P.) scores will increase as demonstrated by a minimum of a 5% improvement from 2010 to 2011. Each and every student of the sub-groups will meet or exceed A.Y.P. on the 2010 M.E.A.P. The gaps between sub groups will narrow by 9%.

Gap Statement : I. 6th Grade Findings

A. Special Education(S.E.) compared to Non-S.E.

An achievement gap is evident between S.E. and Non-S.E. students who met or exceeded the standards on the 6th grade M.E.A.P. Reading Test. In 2005, there was a 10% gap. In 2006, the gap increased significantly to 49%, but dropped by 8% in 2007. The gap from 2007 of 41% increased by 7% to 49% in 2008. In 2009 the gap between SE and non-SE was 16%, which is a significant decrease.

B. Limited English Proficiency (L.E.P.) compared to Non-L.E.P.

An achievement gap is evident between L.E.P. and Non-L.E.P. students who met or exceeded the standards on the 6th grade M.E.A.P. Reading test. In 2005, there was an 8% gap. In 2006, the gap increased significantly to 34%, but dropped by 1% in 2007. The 33% gap in 2007 increased by 13% in 2008, leaving a 46%. In 2009 the gap decreased by 1%.

C. Economically Disadvantaged(E.D.) compared to Non-E.D.

An achievement gap is evident between ED and non-ED students who met or exceeded the standards on the 6th grade M.E.A.P. Reading Test. In 2005, there was a 10% gap. In 2006, the gap dropped to 10%, but increased by 8% in 2007. The 18% gap in 2007 increased to 23% in 2008. In 2009 the gap decreased by 1%.

D. Male compared to Female

An achievement gap is evident between male and female students who met or exceeded the standards on the 6th grade M.E.A.P. Reading Test. In 2005, 13% more females met or exceeded the standards. The gap decreased to 7% in 2006, and increased to 15% in 2007. In 2008 3% of the males scored higher than females; by 2009 10% of the females scored higher than the males.

II. 7th Grade Findings:

A. Special Education(S.E.) compared to Non-S.E.

A significant achievement gap is evident between S.E. and Non-S.E. students who met or exceeded the standards on the 7th grade M.E.A.P. Reading Test. In 2005, there was a 39% gap. In 2006, the gap increased to 52%, but dropped by 12% in 2007. In 2008, there was a 17% gap, an increase of 5%. In 2009 the gap decreased by 1%.

B. Limited English Proficiency (L.E.P.) compared to Non-L.E.P.

An achievement gap is evident between L.E.P. and Non-L.E.P. students who met or exceeded the standards on the

7th grade M.E.A.P. Reading Test. In 2005, there was a 12% gap. The gap increased to 19% in 2006, and a significant gap of 50% existed in 2007. In 2008, there was a 26% gap, a decrease of 24%. In 2009 the gap increased to 54% a significant increase.

C. Economically Disadvantaged(E.D.) compared to Non-E.D.

An achievement gap is evident between E.D. and Non-E.D. students who met or exceeded the standards on the 7th grade M.E.A.P. Reading Test. In 2005, there was a 3% gap. In 2006, the gap increased to 4%, and a significant gap of 26% existed in 2007. However, in 2008 the gap decreased to 15%. In 2009 the gap increased by 6% reaching 21%.

D. Male compared to Female

An achievement gap is evident between male and female students who met or exceeded the standards on the 7th grade M.E.A.P. Reading Test. In 2005, 13% more females met or exceeded the standards . The gap decreased to 7% in 2006, but returned to 13% in 2007 and 16% in 2008. In 2009 the gap reversed and 6% of the males outperformed females.

III. 8th Grade Findings:

A. Special Education(S.E.) compared to Non-S.E.

A significant achievement gap is evident between S.E. and Non-S.E. students who met or exceeded the standards on the 8th grade M.E.A.P. Reading Test. In 2005, there was a 54% gap. In 2006, the gap remained at 54%, but dropped by 11% in 2007. In 2008, the gap between SE and non-SE decreased by 17% to a gap of 26%. In 2009 the gap increased to 39%.

B. Limited English Proficiency(L.E.P.) compared to Non-L.E.P.

A significant achievement gap is evident between L.E.P. and Non-L.E.P. students who met or exceeded the standards on the 8th grade M.E.A.P. Reading Test. In 2005, there was a 37% gap. The gap decreased to 28% in 2006, but increased to 38% in 2007. In 2008, the gap between L.E.P. and Non-L.E.P. increased by 7%. In 2009 the gap is 39% a decrease of 6%

C. Economically Disadvantaged(E.D.) compared to Non-E.D.

An achievement gap was eliminated between E.D. and Non-E.D. students who met or exceeded the standards on the 8th grade M.E.A.P. Reading Test from 2005 to 2007. In 2005, there was a 27% gap. In 2006, the gap decreased to 6%, and disappeared in 2007. However, the gap returned to 21% in 2008. In 2009 the gap decreased by 9% to 12%.

D. Male compared to Female

An achievement gap is evident between male and female students who met or exceeded the standards on the 8th grade M.E.A.P. Reading Test. In 2005, 19% of the females outperformed the males. The gap decreased to 17% in 2006, but returned to 19% in 2007. In 2008 the gap closed significantly, as 4% of the females outperformed males. In 2009 the gap increased to 21%.

Cause for Gap : I. 6th Grade Findings

A. Special Education(S.E.) compared to Non-SE: The S.E. have difficulties in the following areas:

- Understanding the meaning of vocabulary in context
- Identifying the author's purpose
- Identifying the character's motive
- Identifying use of quotation marks
- Recognizing the type of organizational pattern
- Finding the author's main purpose in including a diagram
- Retelling
- Identifying important details
- Cause/Effect
- Summarizing a Identifying relevant information and details
- Analyzing the theme
- Drawing conclusions

- Making inferences about a character
- Comparing characters using inferences

B. Limited English Proficiency(L.E.P.) compared to Non-L.E.P.: The L.E.P. students have difficulties in the following areas:

- Understanding the meaning of vocabulary in context
- Identifying the author's purpose
- Identifying the character's motive
- Identifying use of quotation marks
- Recognizing the type of organizational pattern
- Finding the author's main purpose in including a diagram
- Retelling
- Identifying important details
- Cause/Effect
- Summarizing a Identifying relevant information and details
- Analyzing the theme
- Drawing conclusions
- Making inferences about a character
- Comparing characters using inferences

C. Economically Disadvantaged(E.D.)compared to Non-ED: The E.D. students have difficulties in the following areas:

- Themes across text
- Vocabulary
- Summarizing
- Text features
- Literary devices
- Elements and styles of informational and narrative genre

D. Male compared to Female: No data received to determine cause.

II. 7th Grade Findings:

A. Special Education (S.E.) compared to Non-S.E.: The S.E. students have difficulties in the following areas:

- Analyzing narrative genre
- Retelling & summarizing
- Analyzing in order to draw inferences
- Describing characters
- Identifying persuasive and misleading information
- Summarizing

B. Limited English Proficiency(L.E.P.) compared to Non-L.E.P.: The L.E.P. students have difficulties in the following areas:

- Stating themes/truths across text
- Retelling & summarizing
- Analyzing

C. Economically Disadvantaged(E.D.) compared to Non-E.D.: The E.D. students have difficulties in the following areas:

- analyzing
- summarizing and retelling
- stating themes across texts

D. Male compared to Female: No data received to determine cause.

III. 8th Grade Findings:

A. Special Education(S.E.) compared to Non-S.E.: The S.E. students have difficulties in the following areas:

- Analysis
- Retelling
- Making meaning through context clues
- Recognizing unfamiliar words
- Making connections.

B. Limited English Proficiency(L.E.P.)compared to Non-L.E.P.: The L.E.P. students have difficulties in the following areas:

- Making connections across texts
- Comprehension
- Analyzing
- Retelling
- Summarizing

C. Economically Disadvantaged(E.D.) compared to Non-E.D.: The E.D. students have difficulties in the following areas:

- Retelling
- Summarizing
- Comprehending text features
- Making connections
- Analyzing

D. Male compared to Female: No data received to determine cause.

Multiple measures/sources of data you used to identify this gap in student achievement : 1. Michigan Educational Assessment Program(M.E.A.P.)
 2. Scholastic Reading Inventory(S.R.I.)
 3. Directed Reading Assessment(D.R.A.)

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? 1. Successmaker Progress
 2. Michigan Educational Assessment Program(M.E.A.P.)Progress
 3. Scholastic Reading Inventory(S.R.I.)Progress
 4. Directed Reading Assessment(D.R.A.)Progress

Goal Progress Update:

Date	User	Progress Status	Explanation of Progress Status
08/16/2010	maconoj@dearborn.k12.mi.us	In Progress	Target areas have been corrected and reflect the targets for each goal
04/22/2010	maconoj@dearborn.k12.mi.us	In Progress	Progress Status changed from Open to In Progress
03/26/2010	maconoj@dearborn.k12.mi.us	In Progress	This Goal has been adopted by the staff, we are engaged in professional development for implementation each week and it is being implemented in each classroom.

Contact Name : Elaine Fleezanis

List of Objectives:

ID	Objective
2146	Students will realize one year's growth (or more) for one year of instruction which will result in a 5% improvement on the eMEAP reading assessment from 2009 to 2010. Each student in a sub-group will meet or exceed A.Y.P. on the 2010 MEAP. The gaps between sub groups will narrow by 9%.

1.1. Objective: Increase Comprehension

Measurable Objective Statement to Support Goal : Students will realize one year's growth (or more) for one year of instruction which will result in a 5% improvement on the eMEAP reading assessment from 2009 to 2010. Each student in a sub-group will meet or exceed A.Y.P. on the 2010 MEAP. The gaps between sub groups will narrow by 9%.

Objective Progress Update:

Date	User	Progress Status	Explanation of Progress Status
08/16/2010	maconoj@dearborn.k12.mi.us	In Progress	Progress Status changed from Open to In Progress
04/22/2010	maconoj@dearborn.k12.mi.us	In Progress	Progress Status changed from Open to In Progress
03/26/2010	maconoj@dearborn.k12.mi.us	In Progress	Progress Status changed from Open to In Progress

List of Strategies:

ID	Strategy	Locked By
2146	1.1.1 Strategy: Improve Reading Comprehension - Creating Meaning Strategy Statement: Teachers will use the following strategies in their classes: Identifying Similarities and Differences Strategies Model Teacher-Directed Comparison Model Teacher-Directed Classification Tasks Differentiated Instruction Cooperative Learning Summarizing and Note Taking Strategies Share and identify characteristics of good summaries Model and co-construct written summaries of text Model writing a summary using the "Rule-Based" strategy (Delete, Substitute, Select) Model a graphic organizer to help create a summary Model how to identify story elements and expository elements Model how to distinguish between more important and less important ideas and details Model how to select and interpret important facts, time sequences, cause/effect sequences and episodes Read Alouds Scaffolding Think Alouds Model how to use key words to identify specific information in the text Provide teacher prepared notes Provide visual outlines and graphics Teach students how and when to use and construct graphic organizers Model the use of non linguistic representations Reciprocal Teaching Differentiated Instruction Cooperative Learning Cues, Questions and Advance Organizer Strategies Use questions before, during, and after the learning Use cues and questions that focus on what is important vs. unusual Use Bloom's Taxonomy to develop questions Use advanced organizers to facilitate learning Model Q.A.R Differentiated Instruction Cooperative Learning Vocabulary	

<p>Strategies Teach vocabulary using Marzano's Five Step Process Model text features Engage students in activities that help them add to their knowledge of the terms Differentiated Instruction Interpretation and Reflection Strategies Teach and share examples of inferences based on facts, time sequences, cause/effect sequences and episodes Model how to identify important text implications Model and provide opportunities to identify the significant message or event in a story Model how to support opinions/positions with details from the text Differentiated Instruction Literal Comprehension Strategies Model the use of key words to identify specific information from the text Model and support how to locate and use nonfiction text features Model how to create and use graphic organizers to keep track of important ideas and facts Differentiated Instruction</p>	
---	--

1.1.1. Strategy: Reading Comprehension Strategies

Strategy Statement: 1.1.1 Strategy: Improve Reading Comprehension - Creating Meaning
 Strategy Statement: Teachers will use the following strategies in their classes:

Identifying Similarities and Differences Strategies

Model Teacher-Directed Comparison

Model Teacher-Directed Classification Tasks

Differentiated Instruction

Cooperative Learning

Summarizing and Note Taking Strategies

Share and identify characteristics of good summaries

Model and co-construct written summaries of text

Model writing a summary using the "Rule-Based" strategy (Delete, Substitute, Select)

Model a graphic organizer to help create a summary

Model how to identify story elements and expository elements

Model how to distinguish between more important and less important ideas and details

Model how to select and interpret important facts, time sequences, cause/effect sequences and episodes

Read Alouds

Scaffolding

Think Alouds

Model how to use key words to identify specific information in the text

Provide teacher prepared notes

Provide visual outlines and graphics

Teach students how and when to use and construct graphic organizers

Model the use of non linguistic representations

Reciprocal Teaching

Differentiated Instruction

Cooperative Learning

Cues, Questions and Advance Organizer Strategies

Use questions before, during, and after the learning

Use cues and questions that focus on what is important vs. unusual

Use Bloom's Taxonomy to develop questions

Use advanced organizers to facilitate learning

Model Q.A.R

Differentiated Instruction

Cooperative Learning

Vocabulary Strategies

Teach vocabulary using Marzano's Five Step Process

Model text features

Engage students in activities that help them add to their knowledge of the terms

Differentiated Instruction

Interpretation and Reflection Strategies

Teach and share examples of inferences based on facts, time sequences, cause/effect sequences and episodes

Model how to identify important text implications

Model and provide opportunities to identify the significant message or event in a story

Model how to support opinions/positions with details from the text

Differentiated Instruction

Literal Comprehension Strategies

Model the use of key words to identify specific information from the text

Model and support how to locate and use nonfiction text features

Model how to create and use graphic organizers to keep track of important ideas and facts

Differentiated Instruction

Selected Target Areas

SAR 3.2 Establishes expectations and supports student engagement in the learning process, including opportunities for students to explore application of higher order thinking skills and investigate new approaches to applying their learning

SAR 3.3 Gathers, analyzes, and uses data and research in making curricular and instructional choices

SAR 3.4 Designs and uses instructional strategies, innovations, and activities that are research-based and reflective of best practice

SAR 3.5 Offers a curriculum that challenges each student to excel, reflects a commitment to equity, and demonstrates an appreciation of diversity

SAR 5.10 Provides appropriate support for students with special needs

Other Required Information for Strategy

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

Arter, Judith and McTighe, Jay. Scoring Rubrics in the Classroom

Beaver, Joetta. Directed Reading Assessment 2

Chapman, Carolyn and King, Rita. Differentiated Instructional Strategies for Reading in the Content Area

Fisher, Douglas and Frey, Nancy. Checking for Understanding: Formative Assessment Techniques for Your Classroom

Friend, Marilyn. The Power of Two DVD series Co-Teaching!

Gallagher, Kelly. Teaching Adolescent Writers.

Garner, Betty. Getting to Got It

Mattison, David. Educational Consultant.
 Marzano, Robert. Building Background knowledge and Building Academic Vocabulary
 Marzano, Robert, Pickering, Debra J., Pollock, Jane E., Classroom Instruction That Works
 National Reading Panel, "Teaching Children to Read"
 Payne, Ruby. A Framework for Understanding Poverty.
 Tomlinson, Carol. Differentiation of Instruction
 Tovani, Chris and Ellin Oliver Keene. I Read It but I Don't Get It and Do I Really have To Teach Reading
 Wormeli, Rick. Differentiation from Planning to Practice Grades 6-1
 Wormeli, Rick. Summarization in Any Subject.

Strategy Progress Update:

Date	User	Progress Status	Explanation of Progress Status
08/16/2010	maconoj@dearborn.k12.mi.us	In Progress	Progress Status changed from Open to In Progress
04/22/2010	maconoj@dearborn.k12.mi.us	In Progress	Progress Status changed from Open to In Progress
03/26/2010	maconoj@dearborn.k12.mi.us	In Progress	Progress Status changed from Open to In Progress

List of Activities:

Activity	Begin Date	End Date	Staff Responsible
Identifying Similarities and Differences Activities -Student-Directed Comparison Task Graphic Organizers for Comparison Venn Diagram Comparison Matrix -Student-Directed Classification Task Venn Diagram Classification Matrix -Creating metaphors and analogies -Focused Practice Summarizing and Note Taking Activities -Students identify good summaries -Create summaries using the "Rule-Based" strategy -Use Summary Frames Narrative Topic Restriction Illustration Frame Definition Frame Argumentation Frame Problem Solution Frame Conversation Frame -Graphic organizers -Practice oral and written summaries -Reading Response Journals -Create pictographs -Create informal outlines -Use sticky notes to make connections, record questions, key ideas or confusion -Make physical models - Engage in kinesthetic activities -Cooperative Learning - Informal, Formal, Base Groups -Reciprocal Teaching - Focused Practice Cues, Questions and Advance Organizer Activities -"Turn and Talk" -Students will communicate predictions -Students will create and answer questions according to Bloom's Taxonomy -Students will answer questions that elicit inferences -Think, Pair, Share - Cooperative Learning -Q.A.R -Focused Practice -Advance Organizers Expository Narrative Skimming Graphic organizer -Use content specific vocabulary when communicating orally or in writing -Create explanations or descriptions of the term or phrase -Create nonlinguistic representations of the term or phrase Draw a symbol Draw an example Graphic	09/05/2010	06/12/2011	All staff is expected choose appropriate activities that enhance learning within their content areas and record lesson strategy and activity in their SIP handbooks. Each Teacher will record 2 lessons which will include the implementation of 2 strategies and 2 activities per month.

<p>representation Dramatize the term -Word Walls -Foldables with illustrations -Word Games -Vocabulary Dictionaries -Tell a story that integrates the term -Context Clue Chart -Academic Notebook -Highlight prefix or suffix that will help them remember the meaning -Identify synonyms or antonyms -List related words -Translate term into another language for English as a second language learners -Frayer Model -Focused Practice Interpretation and Reflection Activities -Orally and or in writing articulate inferences based on text -Respond to and create inference questions orally or in writing -Engage in dramatization -Write a response including details from the text to support the theme Literal Comprehension Activities - Answer and construct literal questions -Locate and use text features from: charts, graphs, maps, tables, headings, glossary, bold words, graphic organizers, pictures -Focused Practice</p>			
---	--	--	--

1.1.1.1. Activity: Reading Comprehension Activities

Activity Description: Identifying Similarities and Differences Activities

-Student-Directed Comparison Task

Graphic Organizers for Comparison

Venn Diagram

Comparison Matrix

-Student-Directed Classification Task

Venn Diagram

Classification Matrix

-Creating metaphors and analogies

-Focused Practice

Summarizing and Note Taking Activities

-Students identify good summaries

-Create summaries using the "Rule-Based" strategy

-Use Summary Frames

Narrative

Topic Restriction

Illustration Frame

Definition Frame

Argumentation Frame

Problem Solution Frame

Conversation Frame

-Graphic organizers

-Practice oral and written summaries

-Reading Response Journals

-Create pictographs

-Create informal outlines

-Use sticky notes to make connections, record questions, key ideas or confusion

- Make physical models
- Engage in kinesthetic activities
- Cooperative Learning - Informal, Formal, Base Groups
- Reciprocal Teaching
- Focused Practice

Cues, Questions and Advance Organizer Activities

- "Turn and Talk"
- Students will communicate predictions
- Students will create and answer questions according to Bloom's Taxonomy
- Students will answer questions that elicit inferences
- Think, Pair, Share
- Cooperative Learning
- Q.A.R
- Focused Practice
- Advance Organizers

Expository

Narrative

Skimming

Graphic organizer

- Use content specific vocabulary when communicating orally or in writing

- Create explanations or descriptions of the term or phrase

- Create nonlinguistic representations of the term or phrase

Draw a symbol

Draw an example

Graphic representation

Dramatize the term

- Word Walls

- Foldables with illustrations

- Word Games

- Vocabulary Dictionaries

- Tell a story that integrates the term

- Context Clue Chart

- Academic Notebook

- Highlight prefix or suffix that will help them remember the meaning

- Identify synonyms or antonyms

- List related words

- Translate term into another language for English as a second language learners

- Frayer Model

- Focused Practice

Interpretation and Reflection Activities

- Orally and or in writing articulate inferences based on text

- Respond to and create inference questions orally or in writing

- Engage in dramatization

- Write a response including details from the text to support the theme

Literal Comprehension Activities

- Answer and construct literal questions

- Locate and use text features from:

charts, graphs, maps, tables, headings, glossary, bold words, graphic organizers, pictures
-Focused Practice

Activity Type: Maintenance and Revised

Planned staff responsible for implementing activity: All staff is expected choose appropriate activities that enhance learning within their content areas and record lesson strategy and activity in their SIP handbooks. Each Teacher will record 2 lessons which will include the implementation of 2 strategies and 2 activities per month.

Actual staff responsible for implementing activity: KARAALI

HMAYED

SMITH

BATHISH

LECLAIR

DOBRONSKI

KNISLEY

POLIDORI

CHEHAB

WARSOP

HOOL

SCHULKEY

KLEMETSON

DITMAR

SERAZIO

HANNA

FAYAD

FLATT

SALEH

BENNETT

HADDAD

SAAD

ESSEILY

BERRY

SCHWARTZ

SABRA

AGEMY

ABELI

FOURNIER

TURBIN

NAMETH

WOOLLEY

SLOAN

McMULLEN

THOMAS

ROBINSON

SHAMEY

PLASTERS

Planned Timeline: Begin Date - 09/05/2010, End Date - 06/12/2011

Actual Timeline: Begin Date - 09/07/2010, End Date - 06/10/2011

Fiscal Resources Needed for Activity:

Resource	Funding Source	Planned Amount	Actual Amount
Title I Budget Plan	Title I Schoolwide	84,937.00	84,937.00
General Building Budget	General Funds	10,000.00	0.00

Activity Progress Update:

Date	User	Progress Status	Explanation of Progress Status
08/16/2010	maconoj@dearborn.k12.mi.us	In Progress	Progress Status changed from Open to In Progress
04/22/2010	maconoj@dearborn.k12.mi.us	In Progress	This Goal has been adopted by the staff, we are engaged in professional development for implementation each week and it is being implemented in each classroom.
03/26/2010	maconoj@dearborn.k12.mi.us	In Progress	Progress Status changed from Open to In Progress

Goal 2: Problem Solving

Content Area : Math

Goal Source : Continuous Improvement

Development Status : Approved

Student Goal Statement : Math Goal: Math Michigan Education Assessment Program (M.E.A.P.) scores will increase as demonstrated by a minimum of a 5% improvement from 2010 to 2011 and each student of the sub-groups will meet or exceed A.Y.P. on the 2010 MEAP. The gaps between sub groups will narrow by 9%.

Gap Statement : I. 6th Grade Findings:

A. Special Education(S.E.) compared to Non-S.E.

A significant achievement gap is evident between S.E. and non-S.E. students who met or exceeded the standards on the 6th grade M.E.A.P. Math Test. In 2005, there was a 28% gap. In 2006, the gap increased to 29%, and increased again to 41% in 2007. In 2008, the gap between S.E. and Non-S.E. was 51%, an increase of 10% from 2007. In 2009 the gap was 17% a significant decrease of 34%.

B. Limited English Proficiency(L.E.P.) compared to Non-L.E.P.

The achievement gap between L.E.P. compared to Non-L.E.P. students who met or exceeded the standards on the 6th grade M.E.A.P. Math Test varies from year to year. In 2005, L.E.P. students outperformed Non-L.E.P. students by 7%. However, Non-L.E.P. students significantly outperformed L.E.P. students by 17% in 2006 and by 29% in 2007. In 2008, the gap between L.E.P. students and Non-L.E.P. students was 36% which is an increase of 7%. In 2009 the gap decreased 19% to 17%.

C. Economically Disadvantaged(E.D.) compared to Non-E.D.

An achievement gap is evident between E.D. and Non-E.D. students who met or exceeded the standards on the 6th grade M.E.A.P. Math Test. In 2005, there was only 1% gap. The gap increased to 2% in 2006, and increased again to 19% in 2007. There is an 11% gap between economically disadvantaged and non-economically disadvantaged students in 2008. In 2009 the gap was only 5% a decrease of 6%.

D. Male compared to Female

The achievement gap between male and female students who met or exceeded the standards on the 6th grade M.E.A.P. Math Test varies from year to year. In 2005, males scored 2% higher. In 2006, there was no gap, but in 2007, females outperformed males by 8%. 7% of the Males scored higher than females in 2008. In 2009 the gap reversed with 7% of the females scored higher than the males.

II. 7th Grade Findings:

A. Special Education(S.E.) compared to Non-S.E.

A significant achievement gap is evident between S.E. and Non-S.E. students who met or exceeded the standards on the 7th grade M.E.A.P. Math Test. In 2005, there was a 68% gap. In 2006, the gap decreased to 53%, and decreased again to 44% in 2007. In 2008, there was a 48% gap. In 2009 the gap was 15% a significant decrease of 33%.

B. Limited English Proficiency(L.E.P.) compared to Non-L.E.P.

A significant achievement gap is evident between L.E.P. and Non-L.E.P. students who met or exceeded the standards on the 7th grade M.E.A.P. Math Test. In 2005, there was a 19% gap. The gap increased to 28% in 2006, but decreased by 6% in 2007. In 2008, there was a 12% gap. In 2009 the gap decreased 6% to 22%.

C. Economically Disadvantaged(E.D.) compared to Non-E.D.

An achievement gap is evident between E.D. and Non-E.D. students who met or exceeded the standards on the 7th grade M.E.A.P. Math Test. In 2005, there was a 7% gap. The gap decreased to 12% in 2006 and 2007. In 2008 the gap increased to 8%. In 2009 the gap was only 4% a decrease of 8%.

D. Male compared to Female

A slight achievement gap is evident between male and female students who met or exceeded the standards on the 7th grade M.E.A.P. Math Test. Females have outperformed the males over time. In 2005, there was a 3% gap. The gap increased to 6% in 2006, but returned to 3% in 2007 and 6% in 2008. In 2009 the gap reversed with 4% of the males scoring higher than the females.

III. 8th Grade Findings:

A. Special Education(S.E.) compared to Non-S.E.

A significant achievement gap is evident between S.E. and Non-S.E. students who met or exceeded the standards on the 8th grade M.E.A.P. Math Test. In 2005, there was a 47% gap. In 2006, the gap increased to 60%, but decreased by 15% in 2007. In 2008, the gap between SE and non-SE is 30% an decrease of 15%. In 2009 the gap was 46% which was an increase of 16%.

B. Limited English Proficiency(L.E.P.) compared to Non-L.E.P.

A significant achievement gap is evident between L.E.P. and Non-L.E.P. students who met or exceeded the standards on the 8th grade M.E.A.P. Math Test. In 2005, there was a 32% gap. The gap decreased to 25% in 2006, but increased by 2% in 2007. In 2008 the gap between L.E.P. and Non-L.E.P. was 23%, a decrease of 4%. In 2009 the gap was 39% a significant increase of 16%.

C. Economically Disadvantaged(E.D.) compared to Non-E.D.

An achievement gap is evident between E.D. and Non-E.D. students who met or exceeded the standards on the 8th grade M.E.A.P. Math Test. In 2005, there was a significant gap of 35%. However, the gap decreased dramatically to 8% in 2006 and only 1% in 2007. In 2008 the gap was 2% and in 2009 the gap increased to 18%.

D. Male compared to Female. The achievement gap between male and female students who met or exceeded the standards on the 6th grade M.E.A.P. Math Test varies from year to year. In 2005, males scored 4% higher. However, females outperformed males by 6% in 2007 and 1% in 2008. In 2009 4% of the females s scored higher than males.

Cause for Gap : I. 6th Grade Findings

A. Special Education(S.E.) compared to Non-S.E.: The S.E. students have difficulties in the following areas:

- Interpretation
- Comprehension
- Application
- Evaluation
- Analysis

B. Limited English Proficiency(L.E.P.) compared to Non-L.E.P.: The L.E.P. students have difficulties in the following areas:

- Interpretation
- Comprehension
- Application
- Evaluation
- Analysis

C. Economically Disadvantaged(E.D.) compared to Non-E.D.: The E.D. students have difficulties in the following areas:

- Interpretation
- Comprehension
- Application
- Evaluation
- Analysis

D. Male compared to Female no information was provided to determine causation.

II. 7th Grade Findings:

A. Special Education(S.E.) compared to Non-S.E.: The S.E. students have difficulties in the following areas:

- Applying
- Analyzing

B. Limited English Proficiency(L.E.P.) compared to Non-L.E.P.: The L.E.P. students have difficulties in the following areas:

- Comprehension
- Application
- Analysis

C. Economically Disadvantaged(E.D.) compared to Non-E.D.: The E.D. students have difficulties in the following areas:

- Comprehension
- Application
- Analysis

D. Male compared to Female no information was provided to determine causation

III. 8th Grade Findings:

A. Special Education(S.E.) compared to Non-S.E.: The S.E. students have difficulties in the following areas:

- Calculate, convert, problem solving rates, ratios, and proportions.
- Number operations with integers
- Estimating Computations
- Computing algebraic expressions
- Understand; Apply & solve linear relations, charts and graphs, and equations.
- Draw and construct geometric objects
- Understand the concept of similar polygons and solve related problems.
- Computing and interpreting statistics and data sets
- Interpreting and creating data

B. Limited English Proficiency(L.E.P.) compared to Non-L.E.P.: The L.E.P. students have difficulties in the following areas:

- Application of basic math computations.
- Interpreting charts and graphs.
- How to calculate percent increase and decrease
- Problem solving and synthesis
- Calculating rates of change
- Understanding properties of numbers and equations

C. Economically Disadvantaged(E.D.) compared to Non-E.D.: The E,D. students have difficulties in the following areas:

- Computing with rational numbers
- Estimation
- Finding relationships with tables, graphs and formulas
- Understanding/solving inversely proportional relationships
- Converting units
- Changing unit systems
- Understanding concept of similar polygons
- Creating graphical representations

D. Male compared to Female no information was provided to determine causation.

Multiple measures/sources of data you used to identify this gap in student achievement : 1. Michigan Educational Assessment Program(M.E.A.P.)

2. Star Math

3. District Common Math Assessments

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? 1. Michigan Educational Assessment Program(M.E.A.P.)progress.

2. Star Math progress.

3. District Common Math Assessments progress.

Goal Progress Update:

Date	User	Progress Status	Explanation of Progress Status
08/16/2010	maconoj@dearborn.k12.mi.us	In Progress	Target areas have been corrected and reflect the targets for each goal
03/26/2010	maconoj@dearborn.k12.mi.us	In Progress	This Goal has been adopted by the staff, we are engaged in professional development for implementation each week and it is being implemented in each classroom.

Contact Name : Lisa Klemetson

List of Objectives:

ID	Objective
2141	Students will improve their problem solving abilities, which will result in a 5% increase on the 2010 Math

MEAP. Each student in a sub-groups will meet or exceed A.Y.P. The gaps between sub groups will narrow by 9%.

2.1. Objective: Problem Solving

Measurable Objective Statement to Support Goal : Students will improve their problem solving abilities, which will result in a 5% increase on the 2010 Math MEAP. Each student in a sub-groups will meet or exceed A.Y.P. The gaps between sub groups will narrow by 9%.

Objective Progress Update:

Date	User	Progress Status	Explanation of Progress Status
08/16/2010	maconoj@dearborn.k12.mi.us	In Progress	Progress Status changed from Open to In Progress
03/26/2010	maconoj@dearborn.k12.mi.us	In Progress	Progress Status changed from Open to In Progress. This Goal has been adopted by the staff, we are engaged in professional development for implementation each week and it is being implemented in each classroom.

List of Strategies:

ID	Strategy	Locked By
2141	Teachers will use the following strategies in their classes: -Model how to approach a problem - Use inductive or deductive reasoning to form predictions or questions -Model how to find similarities and differences and how it impacts the outcome -Model strategies for computation - Focused Instruction (mini-lesson) -Differentiated Instruction -Cooperative Learning	

2.1.1. Strategy: Problem Solving Strategies

Strategy Statement:

Teachers will use the following strategies in their classes:

- Model how to approach a problem
- Use inductive or deductive reasoning to form predictions or questions
- Model how to find similarities and differences and how it impacts the outcome
- Model strategies for computation
- Focused Instruction (mini-lesson)
- Differentiated Instruction
- Cooperative Learning

Selected Target Areas

SAR 3.2 Establishes expectations and supports student engagement in the learning process, including opportunities for students to explore application of higher order thinking skills and investigate new approaches to applying their learning
SAR 3.3 Gathers, analyzes, and uses data and research in making curricular and instructional choices
SAR 3.4 Designs and uses instructional strategies, innovations, and activities that are research-based and reflective of best practice
SAR 3.5 Offers a curriculum that challenges each student to excel, reflects a commitment to equity, and demonstrates an appreciation of diversity
SAR 5.10 Provides appropriate support for students with special needs

Other Required Information for Strategy

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

The research support for the math strategies described below is:
 Arter, Judith and McTighe, Jay. Scoring Rubrics in the Classroom
 Chapman, Carolyn and King, Rita. Differentiated Instructional Strategies for Reading in the Content Area
 Fisher , Douglas and Frey, Nancy. Checking for Understanding: Formative Assessment Techniques for Your Classroom
 Friend, Marilyn. The Power of Two DVD series Co-Teaching!
 Garner, Betty. Getting to Got It
 Maccini, P. and K. Ruhl. "Effects of a Graduated Instructional Sequence on the Algebraic Subtraction of Integers by Secondary Students with Learning Disabilities."
 Maccini, P. and C.A. Hughes. "Effects of a Problem-Solving Strategy on the Introductory Algebra Performance of Secondary Students with Learning Disabilities."
 Mattison, David. Educational Consultant.
 Marzano, Robert. Building Background knowledge and Building Academic Vocabulary
 Marzano, Robert. Class Room Instruction That Works
 Payne, Ruby. A Framework for Understanding Poverty.
 Tomlinson, Carol. Differentiation of Instruction
 Wormeli, Rick. Differentiation from Planning to Practice Grades 6-1
 Wormeli, Rick. Summarization in Any Subject.

Strategy Progress Update:

Date	User	Progress Status	Explanation of Progress Status
08/16/2010	maconoj@dearborn.k12.mi.us	In Progress	Progress Status changed from Open to In Progress
03/26/2010	maconoj@dearborn.k12.mi.us	In Progress	Progress Status changed from Open to In Progress This Goal has been adopted by the staff, we are engaged in professional development for implementation each week and it is being implemented in each classroom.

List of Activities:

Activity	Begin Date	End Date	Staff Responsible
Problem Solving Activities -Real life applications - Explain their hypothesis and conclusions -Constructed responses -Written responses -Use problem solving frameworks Historical Investigations Inventions Experimental Inquiry Decision Making -Write position papers -Practice analyzing, interpreting, and applying information using maps, graphs, charts etc. - LAMPS -SLOBS -FOIL -SLOTS -Complete problems in multiple formats -Translate written responses into numeric/graphic representations -Use rubrics to evaluate information -Graphic organizers - Measurement, analysis and computation drills -Math games -Math labs -Success Maker -Manipulatives - Timelines -Capstone Project	09/08/2010	06/18/2011	All staff is expected choose appropriate activities that enhance learning within their content areas and record lessons in their SIP handbooks. Each Teacher will record 2 lessons which will include the implementation of 2 strategies and 2 activities per month.

2.1.1.1. Activity: Problem Solving Activities

Activity Description: Problem Solving Activities

- Real life applications
- Explain their hypothesis and conclusions
- Constructed responses
- Written responses
- Use problem solving frameworks
- Historical Investigations
- Inventions
- Experimental Inquiry
- Decision Making
- Write position papers
- Practice analyzing, interpreting, and applying information using maps, graphs, charts etc.
- LAMPS
- SLOBS
- FOIL
- SLOTS
- Complete problems in multiple formats
- Translate written responses into numeric/graphic representations
- Use rubrics to evaluate information
- Graphic organizers
- Measurement, analysis and computation drills
- Math games
- Math labs
- Success Maker
- Manipulatives
- Timelines

-Capstone Project

Activity Type: Maintenance and Revised

Planned staff responsible for implementing activity: All staff is expected choose appropriate activities that enhance learning within their content areas and record lessons in their SIP handbooks. Each Teacher will record 2 lessons which will include the implementation of 2 strategies and 2 activities per month.

Actual staff responsible for implementing activity: KARAALI

HMAYED

SMITH

BATHISH

LECLAIR

DOBRONSKI

KNISLEY

POLIDORI

CHEHAB

WARSOP

HOOL

SCHULKEY

KLEMETSON

DITMAR

SERAZIO

HANNA

FAYAD

FLATT

SALEH

BENNETT

HADDAD

SAAD

ESSEILY

BERRY

SCHWARTZ

SABRA

AGEMY

ABELI

FOURNIER

TURBIN

NAMETH

WOOLLEY

SLOAN

McMULLEN

THOMAS

ROBINSON

SHAMEY

PLASTERS

Planned Timeline: Begin Date - 09/08/2010, End Date - 06/18/2011

Actual Timeline: Begin Date - 09/07/2010, End Date - 06/10/2011

Fiscal Resources Needed for Activity:

Resource	Funding Source	Planned Amount	Actual Amount
Title I budget plan	Title I Schoolwide	84,937.00	84,937.00
General District Building Budget	General Funds	10,000.00	10,000.00

Activity Progress Update:

Date	User	Progress Status	Explanation of Progress Status
08/16/2010	maconoj@dearborn.k12.mi.us	In Progress	Progress Status changed from Open to In Progress
03/26/2010	maconoj@dearborn.k12.mi.us	In Progress	This Goal has been adopted by the staff, we are engaged in professional development for implementation each week and it is being implemented in each classroom.

Goal 3: Communication: Written and Oral

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

Student Goal Statement : Communication: Written and Oral: District Common Writing Assessment scores will increase as demonstrated by proficient scores using the 6+1 writing assessment rubric from the fall of 2010 to the spring of 2011 Sub-group scores will be proficient and the gaps between sub groups will narrow by 9%.

Gap Statement : I. 6th Grade Findings

A. Special Education(S.E.) compared to Non-S.E.

A significant achievement gap is evident between S.E. and Non-S.E. students who met or exceeded the standards on the 6th grade Michigan Education Assessment Program (M.E.A.P.) Writing Test. In 2005, there was a 29% gap. In 2006, the gap increased to 49%, but dropped by 7% in 2007. In 2008 the gap was 60% a significant increase of 18%. No information is available for 2009.

B. Limited English Proficiency(L.E.P.) compared to Non-L.E.P.

An achievement gap is evident between L.E.P. and Non-L.E.P. students who met or exceeded the standards on the M.E.A.P. 6th grade Writing Test. In 2005, there was a 1% gap. The gap decreased to 34% in 2006, and decreased by 1% in 2007. In 2008, the gap was 50%, a significant increase of 16%

C. Economically Disadvantaged(E.D.) compared to Non-E.D. No information is available for 2009.

An achievement gap is evident between E.D. and Non-E.D. students who met or exceeded the standards on the 6th grade M.E.A.P. Writing Test. In 2005, there was an 8% gap. The gap increased to 10% in 2006, and increased again to 18% in 2007. In 2008, the gap was 16%, a decrease of 2%. No information is available for 2009.

D. Male compared to Female

An achievement gap is evident between male and female students who met or exceeded the standards on the 6th grade M.E.A.P. Writing Test. In 2005, there was a 6% gap. The gap increased to 7% in 2006, and increased again

to 15% in 2007. In 2008, there was no gap. No information is available for 2009.

II. 7th Grade Findings:

A. Special Education(S.E.) compared to Non-S.E.

A significant achievement gap is evident between S.E. and Non-S.E. students who met or exceeded the standards on the 7th grade M.E.A.P. Writing Test. In 2005, there was a 48% gap. In 2006, the gap increased to 55%, but dropped significantly to 24% in 2007. In 2008 that gap increased to 38%. No information is available for 2009.

B. Limited English Proficiency(L.E.P.) compared to Non-L.E.P.

A significant achievement gap is evident between L.E.P. and Non-L.E.P. students who met or exceeded the standards on the 7th grade M.E.A.P. Writing Test. In 2005, there was a 21% gap. The gap increased to 23% in 2006, and increased again to 29% in 2007. In 2008, the gap was 27%, an increase of 4%.

C. Economically Disadvantaged(E.D.) compared to Non-E.D. No information is available for 2009.

An achievement gap is evident between E.D. and Non-E.D. students who met or exceeded the standards on the 7th grade M.E.A.P. Writing test. In 2005, there was a 12% gap. The gap decreased to 3% in 2006, but increased to 19% in 2007. In 2008, the gap was 17%, a decrease of 2%. No information is available for 2009.

D. Male compared to Female

An achievement gap is evident between male and female students who met or exceeded the standards on the 7th grade M.E.A.P. Writing Test. In 2005, there was a 16% gap. The gap increased to 17% in 2006, and increased again to 18% in 2007. In 2008, the gap was 15%, a decrease of 3%. No information is available for 2009.

III. 8th Grade Findings:

A. Special Education(S.E.) compared to Non-S.E.

A significant achievement gap is evident between S.E. and Non-S.E. students who met or exceeded the standards on the 8th grade M.E.A.P. Writing Test. In 2005, there was a 26% gap. In 2006, the gap increased to 47%, but dropped by 3% in 2007. In 2008 the gap was 28%, a significant drop of 16%. No information is available for 2009.

B. Limited English Proficiency(L.E.P.) compared to Non-L.E.P.

A significant achievement gap is evident between L.E.P. and Non-L.E.P. students who met or exceeded the standards on the 8th grade M.E.A.P. Writing test. In 2005, there was a 31% gap. The gap remained at 31% in 2006, but increased by 3% in 2007. In 2008, the gap was 20%, a significant drop of 14%.

C. Economically Disadvantaged(E.D.) compared to Non-E.D. No information is available for 2009.

An achievement gap is evident between E.D. and Non-E.D. students who met or exceeded the standards on the 8th grade M.E.A.P. Writing test. In 2005, there was a 26% gap. The gap decreased to 17% in 2006, and decreased again to 9% in 2007. In 2008, the gap was 13%, an increase of 4%. No information is available for 2009.

D. Male compared to Female

An achievement gap is evident between male and female students who met or exceeded the standards on the 8th grade M.E.A.P. Writing test. In 2005, there was a 16% gap. The gap increased to 24% in 2006, but decreased to 13% in 2007. In 2008, the gap was 16%, an increase of 3%. No information is available for 2009.

Cause for Gap : I. 6th Grade Findings

A. S.E. compared to Non-S.E.: The Special Education students have difficulties in the following areas:

- Synthesis
- Analysis
- Application
- Comprehension?The English language learners have difficulty with comprehending vocabulary and using vocabulary for their purpose for writing

B. L.E.P. compared to Non-L.E.P.: The L.E.P students have difficulties in the following areas:

- Application

C. E.D. compared to Non-E.D.: The E.D. students have difficulties in the following areas:

- Analysis

D. Male compared to Female: No data received to determine causation.

II. 7th Grade Findings:

A. Special Education(S.E.) compared to Non-S.E.: The S.E. students have difficulties in the following areas:

- Synthesizing expository text
- Analyzing narrative and expository text to determine conflict
- Knowledge of spelling rules

B. Limited English Proficiency(L.E.P.) compared to Non-L.E.P.: The E.D.students have difficulties in the following areas:

- Synthesizing text
- Analyzing narrative and expository text.
- Knowledge of spelling rules

C. Economically Disadvantaged(E.D.) compared to Non-E.D.: The E.D. students have difficulties in the following areas:

- Synthesizing text
- Analyzing narrative and expository text.
- Knowledge of spelling rules

D. Male compared to Female: No data received to determine causation.

III. 8th Grade Findings:

A. Special Education(S.E.) compared to Non-S.E.: The S.E. students have difficulties in the following areas:

- synthesis
- application

B. Limited English Proficiency(L.E.P.)compared to Non-L.E.P.: The L.E.P. students have difficulties in the following areas:

- Comprehension
- Application

C. Economically Disadvantaged(E.D.) compared to Non-E.D.: The E.D. students have difficulties in the following areas:

- Application
- Synthesis

D. Male compared to Female: No data received to determine causation.

Multiple measures/sources of data you used to identify this gap in student achievement : 1. District Common Writing Prompt progress as assessed by the 6 + 1 Writing Traits Rubric progress.

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? 1. Successmaker Progress.

2. District Common Writing Prompt progress as assessed by the 6 + 1 Writing Traits Rubric progress.

Goal Progress Update:

Date	User	Progress Status	Explanation of Progress Status
08/16/2010	maconoj@dearborn.k12.mi.us	In Progress	Target areas have been corrected and reflect the targets for each goal
03/26/2010	maconoj@dearborn.k12.mi.us	In Progress	This Goal has been adopted by the staff, we are engaged in professional development for implementation each week and it is being implemented in each classroom.

Contact Name : Christine Furkioti

List of Objectives:

ID	Objective
4884	Students will increase their writing skills as evidenced from pretesting of the fall 2010 district common writing rubric to the post testing of the spring 2011 district common writing rubric.

3.1. Objective: Improve Writing Skills - Communication

Measurable Objective Statement to Support Goal : Students will increase their writing skills as evidenced from pretesting of the fall 2010 district common writing rubric to the post testing of the spring 2011 district common writing rubric.

Objective Progress Update:

Date	User	Progress Status	Explanation of Progress Status
08/16/2010	maconoj@dearborn.k12.mi.us	In Progress	Progress Status changed from Open to In Progress
03/26/2010	maconoj@dearborn.k12.mi.us	In Progress	Progress Status changed from Open to In Progress

List of Strategies:

ID	Strategy	Locked By
4884	Writing Strategies -Conferencing -Use mentor text to teach and analyze narrative and expository elements and text features -Focused Instruction -Provide constructive feedback and encouragement -Model rubrics and checklists -Model writing using think-alouds -Teach the process of writing -Models writing for a purpose -Use real world examples of writing to show various purposes -Differentiated Instruction -Cooperative Learning	

3.1.1. Strategy: Improve Writing Skills - Communication

Strategy Statement: Writing Strategies

- Conferencing
- Use mentor text to teach and analyze narrative and expository elements and text features
- Focused Instruction
- Provide constructive feedback and encouragement

- Model rubrics and checklists
- Model writing using think-alouds
- Teach the process of writing
- Models writing for a purpose
- Use real world examples of writing to show various purposes
- Differentiated Instruction
- Cooperative Learning

Selected Target Areas

SAR 3.2 Establishes expectations and supports student engagement in the learning process, including opportunities for students to explore application of higher order thinking skills and investigate new approaches to applying their learning
SAR 3.3 Ensures that system-wide curricular and instructional decisions are based on data and research at all levels
SAR 3.4 Designs and uses instructional strategies, innovations, and activities that are research-based and reflective of best practice
SAR 3.5 Offers a curriculum that challenges each student to excel, reflects a commitment to equity, and demonstrates an appreciation of diversity
SAR 5.10 Provides appropriate support for students with special needs

Other Required Information for Strategy

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

Arter, Judith and McTighe, Jay. Scoring Rubrics in the Classroom
 Chapman, Carolyn and King, Rita. Differentiated Instructional Strategies for Reading in the Content Area
 Culham, Ruth. 6+1 Writing Traits
 Fisher, Douglas and Frey, Nancy. Checking for Understanding: Formative Assessment Techniques for Your Classroom
 Frayer, D., W.C. Frederick and H.J. Klausmeier. A Schema for Testing the Level of Cognitive Mastery.
 Friend, Marilyn. The Power of Two DVD series Co-Teaching!
 Gallagher, Kelly. Teaching Adolescent Writers
 Garner, Betty. Getting to Got It
 Mattison, David. Educational Consultant.
 Marzano, Robert. Building Background knowledge and Building Academic Vocabulary
 Marzano, Robert, Pickering, Debra J., Pollock, Jane E., Classroom Instruction That Works
 Rice, Lynda. 6 Trait Writing.
 Tomlinson, Carol. Differentiation of Instruction
 Payne, Ruby. A Framework for Understanding Poverty.
 Woods, Karen and Harmon, Janis. Strategies for Integrating Reading and Writing in Middle and High School Classrooms
 Wormeli, Rick. Differentiation from Planning to Practice Grades 6-1

Strategy Progress Update:

Date	User	Progress Status	Explanation of Progress Status
08/16/2010	maconoj@dearborn.k12.mi.us	In Progress	Progress Status changed from Open to In Progress

03/26/2010	maconoj@dearborn.k12.mi.us	In Progress	Progress Status changed from Open to In Progress
------------	----------------------------	-------------	--

List of Activities:

Activity	Begin Date	End Date	Staff Responsible
Writing Activities -Writing prompts -Analyze narrative and expository elements and text features -Constructed responses -Graphic organizers -Score papers using writing rubrics and checklists -Summarizing and note taking - Focused practice -Write for a purpose Express and reflect Inquire and explore Inform and explain Analyze and interpret Take a stand Evaluate and judge Propose a solution Seek common ground	09/08/2010	06/18/2011	All staff is expected choose appropriate activities that enhance learning within their content areas and record lessons in their SIP handbooks. Each Teacher will record 2 lessons which will include the implementation of 2 strategies and 2 activities per month.

3.1.1.1. Activity: Writing Activities

Activity Description: Writing Activities

- Writing prompts
- Analyze narrative and expository elements and text features
- Constructed responses
- Graphic organizers
- Score papers using writing rubrics and checklists
- Summarizing and note taking
- Focused practice
- Write for a purpose
- Express and reflect
- Inquire and explore
- Inform and explain
- Analyze and interpret
- Take a stand
- Evaluate and judge
- Propose a solution
- Seek common ground

Activity Type: Maintenance and Revised

Planned staff responsible for implementing activity: All staff is expected choose appropriate activities that enhance learning within their content areas and record lessons in their SIP handbooks. Each Teacher will record 2 lessons which will include the implementation of 2 strategies and 2 activities per month.

Actual staff responsible for implementing activity: KARAALI
HMAIED
SMITH

BATHISH
 LECLAIR
 DOBRONSKI
 KNISLEY
 POLIDORI
 CHEHAB
 WARSOP
 HOOL
 SCHULKEY
 KLEMETSON
 DITMAR
 SERAZIO
 HANNA
 FAYAD
 FLATT
 SALEH
 BENNETT
 HADDAD
 SAAD
 ESSEILY
 BERRY
 SCHWARTZ
 SABRA
 AGEMY
 ABELI
 FOURNIER
 TURBIN
 NAMETH
 WOOLLEY
 SLOAN
 McMULLEN
 THOMAS
 ROBINSON
 SHAMEY
 PLASTERS

Planned Timeline: Begin Date - 09/08/2010, End Date - 06/18/2011

Actual Timeline: Begin Date - 09/07/2010, End Date - 06/15/2011

Fiscal Resources Needed for Activity:

Resource	Funding Source	Planned Amount	Actual Amount
Title I Budget Plan	Title I Schoolwide	84,937.00	84,937.00
General District Budget	General Funds	10,000.00	10,000.00

Activity Progress Update:

Date	User	Progress Status	Explanation of Progress Status
08/16/2010	maconoj@dearborn.k12.mi.us	In Progress	Progress Status changed from Open to In Progress
03/26/2010	maconoj@dearborn.k12.mi.us	In Progress	Progress Status changed from Open to In Progress. This Goal has been adopted by the staff, we are engaged in professional development for implementation each week and it is being implemented in each classroom.

Resource Profile

Funding Source	Planned Amount	Actual Amount
General Funds	\$30,000.00	\$20,000.00
Title I Schoolwide	\$254,811.00	\$254,811.00

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
Mrs.	Julia	Maconochie	Prinicpal	maconoj@dearborn.k12.mi.us
Mr.	Ibrahim	Mashhour	Assistant Principal	mashouri@dearborn.k12.mi.us
Mrs.	Elaine	Fleezanis	Literacy Coach	fleezae@dearborn.k12.mi.us
Mrs.	Christine	Furkioti	Literacy Coach	furkioc@dearborn.k12.mi.us
Mrs.	Reem	Bathish	Teacher	bathisr@dearborn.k12.mi.us
Mrs.	Fatima	Tekko	Community Liason	tekkof@dearborn.k12.mi.us
Mrs.	Randa	Marwani	PFSO President	randamarwani@hotmail.com
Mrs.	Maha	Fayad	Teacher	fayadm@dearborn.k12.mi.us
Mr.	David	Olszewski	Teacher	olszewd@dearborn.k12.mi.us
Mrs.	Suzanne	Thomas	Teacher	thomass@dearborn.k12.mi.us
Ms.	Samantha	Flatt	Teacher	flatts@dearborn.k12.mi.us
Mrs.	Elizabeth	Ditmar	Teacher	ditmare@dearborn.k12.mi.us
Mrs.	Shadia	Saleh	Support Staff	salehs@dearborn.k12.mi.us
Mrs.	Lena	Saghir	Parent	a.saghir@sbcglobal.net
Mrs.	Latif	Berry	Parent	none
Mrs.	Hanna	Dakroub	Parent	none
Mrs.	Lisa	Crumb	Parent	None
Mr.	Steven	Saleh	Teacher	salehs@dearborn.k12.mi.us
Mr.	Francis	Serazio	Teacher	serazif@dearborn.k12.mi.us

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

Planning:

Stout Middle School invites parents to be involved in programming, including their participation in the development of the parent involvement plan. Meetings will be conducted once each month with parents and we will provide child care, flexible scheduling, or whatever assistance the school may be able to provide parents in order to better ensure their attendance at meetings, and we will provide translation of information in a language the parents can understand. Each year, we conduct surveys of students, parents, and staff. Information from these surveys is then used during the design phase of the school improvement process.

Design:

The School Improvement Plan of Stout Middle School is designed using information from various surveys, assessments, and research. All core areas addressed math, reading, and writing goals for the school. Each of the departments based their goals on the gaps that are evidence over time on the MEAP and Terra Nova Assessment between the LEP and Non-LEP students and the Special Education and the Non Special Education Students. Further consideration for the formation of these goals were the results of our local assessment in

math and reading comprehension, just about 50% of our total population are reading below grade level according to our Scholastic Reading Inventory Assessment (SRI) and similarly our Star Math Assessment of Basic Skill indicates the same. Research support for our plan can be found in the goals section of this report.

Monitoring:

The Stout School Improvement Team is primarily responsible for the monitoring of the School Improvement Plan. The team is made of administrators, staff, and parents who meet periodically to review the plan. The plan is also presented to the Dearborn Public School district School Improvement Committee each fall.

Evaluation:

Each year, the School Improvement Plan is evaluated by the Stout Middle School teaching staff and School Improvement team. Data from each year's assessments is analyzed, item analysis is performed, and program evaluation is discussed. The plan is also reviewed by the district assessment office, and the school also hosts an external review conducted by staff from the various other district public schools. An annual evaluation of the parental involvement plan will be conducted with parents, identifying any barriers to greater parental involvement (such as limited English, limited literacy, economic disadvantage, disability, etc.) and devising strategies to improve parental involvement. We will involve parents in an organized, on-going, and timely way in the development, review, and improvement of parent

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

Stout Middle School curriculum adheres to the district-wide curriculum for each content area. The district's curriculum is aligned to the state standards and benchmarks (required by PA 25-380.1277) and grade level content expectations and goes through the curriculum review process guided by the district-wide Curriculum Council. The Council meets eight times a year and has two levels of membership: standing members and ad hoc members. It has representatives from administration, teachers, counselors, colleges, and parents. The Council's purpose is to create one district-level decision-making body that coordinates and monitors all aspects of teaching and learning; curriculum, instruction, assessment, technology integration, and professional development. Stout Middle School adheres to the district curricula and assessments to ensure that each student meets the specified expectations. Our school reports on the curriculum, instruction, and assessment processes (in addition to the rest of the components) yearly through the Indicators of School Performance and has maintained an A on this component of the Ed Yes!

Curriculum committees of each core content area participate in a program of continuous evaluation and review, making adjustments, and responding to external influences as demanded. Committees adhere to established conditions regarding membership, meeting, and report formats. Major revisions will be subject to an established protocol:

1. Presentations to Elementary Forum and Secondary Principals' Meeting
2. Approval by the District Curriculum Council
3. Informational presentation to the Community via District web site, feedback requests, surveys, etc.
4. Informational presentation to the Board and Community, as requested

Any initiative directly related to a subject area must be discussed at the Curriculum Committee and Administrative Forum(s) before being brought to the Council. Any cross-curricular initiative or procedural change must clear associated standing committees and Administrative Forum(s) before being brought to Council. Agenda items suggested by individuals, individual buildings, or individual departments or programs that have not followed these steps will be referred back to appropriate committees.

3. Describe how institution and student information and progress will be shared with all stakeholders in a

language that they can understand.

Marking Period Grades (every six weeks)

1. It is important that parents are able to understand the how their children are doing. We communicate grades to parents on an on-going basis through ParentConnect. Parents easily understand the traditional grade marks. Additionally, comments are provided in easy to understand language (they are printed out as full text instead of just providing numbers).
2. Report cards that occur around Parent-Teacher conferences are distributed at the conferences. Parents who do not attend Parent-Teacher conferences are contacted to come and pick up the report cards.

Progress Reports: Three weeks into the marking periods a progress report is mailed home to any students who are in danger of failing one of their classes

1. Six Week Report Cards:
2. Every six weeks reports cards are distributed to the students.
3. The first and fourth report cards are given to parents attending parent teacher conferences.
4. The second, third, and fifth reports are sent home with the students
5. The final report card is mailed home at the end of the year.

Michigan Education Assessment Program:

1. MEAP data is sent home written in a parent report.
2. The parent report is formatted in language that parents can easily understand.
3. The MEAP parent report is reviewed at a PFSO meeting to insure that parents can understand the report.
4. School wide data is also presented at the PFSO meeting. The data is presented visually in charts and graphs. The principal explains the information and what it means.
5. An interpreter is utilized to translate the information into Arabic.
6. The MEAP data and other data is also sent home as part of our newsletters.
7. The results of our AdvancEd results and state wide accreditation are also shared in our newsletter.
8. Principal provides power point presentation three times per year outlining and exemplifying assessment results and answers questions regarding it.
9. Teachers use parent teacher conference time in the fall and in the spring explain standardized assessment results
10. Communications are sent home in both English and Arabic languages
11. Our community Liaison informs parents on an ongoing basis of their students' academic progress and assessment results and behaviors.

Newsletter and Honor Role: A news letter chocked full of information of parents can use. We also include our Stout Stars (GPA: 3.0-3.5) and our Shining Stars (GPA: 3.5-4.0) reports in the news letter. Communications are sent home in both English and Arabic languages.

ParentConnect: Through our web based program: parentconnect, parents have access school news, class news, attendance, schedules, assignments, assignment details, grade to date per classroom, email access to all teachers, report card marks, unofficial transcripts, grade point averages, and standardized test scores for your child.

Academic Letters: Each marking period, parents will receive a letter if their son/daughter has received failing grades in two or more of their core classes. We share their concern for their child's success in school and therefore send this letter to inform them of interventions we have in place and ideas for them to implement at home. Communications are sent home in both English and Arabic languages.

Stout Middle School Web Site:

We actively use our website as a communication tool for parents and community members. This includes

1. posting the monthly newsletters on-line along

2. posting important information about the school programming
3. School calendars
4. Staff information
5. Email contact for all staff
6. Links to teacher web sites
7. Providing parents with support and tips when it comes to educating their children. Some examples include home work tips, reading tips, mathematics tips, and a parent involvement webpage etc.

We have implemented the usage of electronic mail: All staff emails are available in multiple web and print locations for parents to have 'one click access' such as:

1. Parentconnect parents can easily email administrators and teachers in the building,
2. Teacher email accounts are be posted on the school website in order to allow for easy access to the appropriate information.
3. Stout Middle School has also developed an email list serve with the parents where information can easily be sent out electronically on a daily basis.

Several teachers make use of Dtube and ilearn, which include:

1. Taping and uploading important tutorials and classroom examples that provide important information on school activities. Celebrations of important programmatic or student accomplishments in the school using the Dtube website.
2. Stout Middle School frequently communicates with parents in the use of technology, which provides: parents with basics skills using technology so that they are better able to support their children awareness of the appropriate uses of technology.

Open House, Parent Teacher Conferences, and Orientation Programs: To generate higher parental participation, a series of orientations were conducted at Stout. The principal facilitates a short PowerPoint presentation, which focused on test scores, and strategies parents could use to help their children succeed in school. Following the presentation, report cards were picked up by parents only. This innovative initiative resulted in a 77% attendance rate, which strengthens our commitment to include parents as educational partners. We provide Arabic language translators to assist families as needed.

Parent, Faculty, and Student Organization (PFSO): Stout Middle School parent organization includes the staff and students. As a group, they support activities in our school through volunteer work, special events, and classroom needs. They also provide an additional sounding board for our school improvement plan and school programs. We meet once a week and the principal uses part of that time to keep parents abreast of school programs and initiatives. We provide Arabic language translators to assist families as needed

Community Liaison: Informs parents on an ongoing basis of their students' academic progress and assessment results and behaviors.

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:

Julia Maconochie, Principal

Address:

18500 Oakwood Blvd., Dearborn, MI, 48124

Telephone Number:

313-827-4600

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?

Stout Middle School will be providing multiple types of professional learning activities. First, teachers will be reading "Classroom Instruction That Works," by Marzano. The book, as well as practical uses for this information will be discussed at monthly book study meetings. We will also be holding monthly meetings that will be devoted primarily to data collection and analysis. Teachers will also be trained in Differentiation, Technology, Love & Logic, and Co-Teaching. Stout is also the home to two Title 1 Literacy coaches. These coaches regularly visit our classrooms to work with teachers on creating and implementing successful lessons that target our school improvement initiatives.

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

Staff Salaries and Benefits: \$234,566.37

Language Arts and Social Studies Resource Teacher

Math Lab Teacher

Two Literacy Coaches

Instructional Materials: \$195,000.00

Chapter books: \$9,000; \$3,000 per grade level

Literacy Circle Materials: \$3,000; \$1,000.00 per grade level

Diagnostic and measurement software (SRI, Star Math) maintenance: \$5,000

2 computer lab: 58 computer and monitors, drops, and power: \$100,000-150,000

Level Reading Books: 15,000-20,000

Extended Day Program: \$5,120

1. Four days a week the four core subject areas tutoring opportunities will be available after school Monday - Thursday for 2 hours. $4(2 \times 5) = 40$ hours per week @ \$19.50 per hour

2. Two days a week study hall will be available from 3-5:00 p.m. for students to do their homework and have access to technology: $2 \times 2 =$ Four hours per week @ \$19.50 per

Field Trip Admission & Assemblies: \$1,000

2 Trips each 6, 7, 8th grades @ \$700.00 each

6- Field trips are selected (2 per grade) for reinforcement of classroom experiences and district curriculum. The field trips may include the following learning experiences.

- Ann Arbor Hands On Museum,
- Arab/American Museum,
- African/American Museum,
- Cranbrook planetarium,
- COSI in Toledo,
- Dertoit Institute of Arts,
- Detroit Science Museum.
- Greenfield Village
- Imax Theater

Purchased Services/Professional Development: \$4,000

10 participants @ \$100-\$150 per registration: \$1,000 to \$1,500

Conferences and professional development will include:

- Differentiation
- Co-Teaching
- DRA
- Classroom Management (Love and Logic)
- Successmaker
- Reading/Literacy and content
- Algebra

Contract Teacher Sub (Prof. Dev.): \$2,000

The sub costs are \$95 to \$105 per day.

Contract Teacher Sub (Vacancy): \$17,000

We have hired two subs to help in coordination of our school Literacy. One of the subs is highly qualified and runs our Literacy Lab and the other sub is replacing a Literacy Coach.

Staff Development Materials: \$3,000

Staff meets every Tuesday during team prep time to discuss books chosen to enhance instructional delivery and meeting the needs of our students through understanding how children learn.

Books for PD/Book Club:

- Love and Logic: Jim and Charles Fay
- Checking for Understanding Formative Assessment Techniques for the Classroom: Rick Wormelli
- Meet Me in the Middle: Becoming an Accomplished Middle Level Teacher: Rick Wormelli
- Differentiated Instruction from Planning to Practice: Rick Wormelli
- Fair is not Always Equal: Rick Wormelli

Parent Involvement/Activities: \$1,000

Parents attend school functions with their children, we pay for admissions, Parenting with Love and Logic Classes

Parent Purchase Services: \$500.00

This is money that is used for speakers or food for our parent meetings.

Busses and subs for Field Trips - \$1,500

Transportation for Field Trips to off-set the cost of the trip for the students.

Building Summer School Teachers: \$8,000

We have set aside money to pay for Summer School Staff.

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

Technology is an integral part of students' learning experiences at Stout Middle school. Each of the grade level team has a computer lab, and every core classroom and several extended core classroom have promethean boards. We also use computer based intervention programs that are engaging and interesting to the students. We will also be using the Class A program to manage data and create/use common assessments.