

School Improvement Plan

School Year: 2010

School District: Dearborn City School District

Intermediate School District: Wayne RESA

School Name: Unis Middle School

Grades Served: 6,7,8

Principal: Ms. Rita Rauch

Building Code: 09408

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: Math	7
Goal 2: Reading	12
Goal 3: Writing	16
Resource Profile	22
Title I Required Components	23
Stakeholders	24
Statement of Non-Discrimination	26
Conclusion	27

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:	Unis Middle School
District:	Dearborn City School District
Public/Non-Public:	Public
Grades:	6,7,8
School Code Number:	09408
City:	Dearborn
State/Province:	Michigan
Country:	United States

Vision

Vision Statement

The McCollough-Unis learning community will enable every student to achieve their highest potential.

Mission Statement

- to be assertive
- to be persistent
- to be inquisitive
- to be independent
- to be socially adept
- to be problem solvers
- to be technology savvy
- to be productive citizens
- to be effective communicators
- to have an appreciation for art and music
- to have compassion and empathy for others
- to have a sense of responsibility and independence
- to embrace the Dearborn Public Schools core values

Beliefs Statement

- A student's highest potential is expressed academically, artistically, emotionally and socially.
- Student achievement requires a cooperative effort between parents, staff and the community to provide encouragement, reinforce core values, and serve as role models.
- Instruction is assessment driven, outcome based, active, and engaged.
- Instruction touches the world of each student, providing for different learning styles and needs.
- Education is a life-long process that prepares students to be successful, contributing citizens in a changing world.

Goals

ID	Name	Development Status	Progress Status
4299	Math	Approved	Open
4562	Reading	Approved	Open
4573	Writing	Approved	Open

Goal 1: Math

Content Area : Math

Goal Source : Continuous Improvement

Development Status : Approved

Student Goal Statement : All students will demonstrate increased math competency in all curricular areas as measured by a five percent increase in the number of students that meet or exceed district averages on the MEAP and common assessments.

Gap Statement : Based on a review of our MEAP scores the SE subgroup scored significantly lower in 7th and 8th grades. The seventh grade SE subgroup fell below the target by 37% and the eighth grade by 27%.

Cause for Gap : It has been determined that the leading cause for the gap in performance for the SE subgroup is lack of academic language and vocabulary due to students disabilities in reading, language processing, and math comprehension. As a result, the students have difficulty with reading story problems, retaining information and problem solving.

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

MEAP

Local assessments

District common 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? The measure of success that will be used to monitor progress

-a 5% increase in the number of students that meet or exceed the MEAP standard.

-a 5% increase in the number of students that meet or exceed 80% mastery on the common assessment.

Professional learning will include

-collaboration to develop common assessments with vocabulary, constructed response and graphing components.

-grade level staff and departments will meet to develop higher level thinking questions for each unit of study.

-staff will utilize buidling resources as tools to inform instruction to identify target areas.

Contact Name : Deena Furlow

List of Objectives:

ID	Objective
4324	The number of students that meet or exceed district averages on the MEAP and common assessments will increase by five percent. Working independently students will effectively employ non-linguistic representation in problem solving activities. Students will demonstrate increased competence in basic computations as assessed through daily routines. Students will demonstrate increased competence in correctly answering questions that incorporate non-linguistic representations. Working in small groups students will demonstrate increase competence in problem solving.

1.1. Objective: Math

Measurable Objective Statement to Support Goal : The number of students that meet or exceed district averages on the MEAP and common assessments will increase by five percent.

Working independently students will effectively employ non-linguistic representation in problem solving activities.

Students will demonstrate increased competence in basic computations as assessed through daily routines.

Students will demonstrate increased competence in correctly answering questions that incorporate non-linguistic representations.

Working in small groups students will demonstrate increase competence in problem solving.

List of Strategies:

ID	Strategy	Locked By
4324	-Teachers will develop monthly high level constructed response prompts in departments. - Teachers will use small group conferences for targeted students, objectives, and oral language development. -Instructional coaches will dialogue with and model for staff. -Teachers will authentically incorporate creation, interpretation, and application of graphical representation across the curriculum. -Teachers will assess interventions, constructed response, and develop common assessments in all areas, and keep an assessment portfolio	

1.1.1. Strategy: Math

Strategy Statement:

- Teachers will develop monthly high level constructed response prompts in departments.
- Teachers will use small group conferences for targeted students, objectives, and oral language development.

- Instructional coaches will dialogue with and model for staff.
- Teachers will authentically incorporate creation, interpretation, and application of graphical representation across the curriculum.
- Teachers will assess interventions, constructed response, and develop common assessments in all areas, and keep an assessment portfolio

Selected Target Areas

SAR 3.2 Promotes active involvement of students in the learning process, including opportunities for them to explore application of higher-order thinking skills and investigate new approaches to applying their learning
SAR 4.2 Ensures that student assessment data are used to make decisions for continuous improvement of teaching and learning

Other Required Information for Strategy

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

SIP

Over-arching goals for reading, writing and math gleaned from summative and formative data drive our professional development and instructional practices. Our School Improvement action steps are small group instruction, DRA, constructed response, charts and graphs, rubrics and vocabulary. Improved understandings of instructional approaches, moving from whole to small group (Stiggins, 1987 and Wiggins, 1989) addresses students who "get it" and those who need the lesson's objective presented again, perhaps differently. i.e. Guided reading groups. The DRA formative reading assessment (Joetta Beaver, 2007) assists in student groupings, teaching objectives and text selection for classroom teachers, paraprofessionals and resource teachers. Constructed response (Elsholz and Sperling, 1996) demands high-level reasoning, effective communication of students regardless of the content area. Graphic representation or charts and graphs (NCA, 1999), the interpretation and development is an area of concern for us so we have students interact with charts and graphs in all content areas; physical education and language arts to math, science and social studies. Rubrics, both planning and scoring (Shirley Clark, 2005), provide students with additional support and the staff with a common language. And finally vocabulary, similar to the Frayer Model (Frayer and Klausmeier, 1969), a common approach to vocabulary consistent across the content areas is a powerful reinforcement for students. And again a common language for staff allows for valuable dialogue.

SUB groups

The Response To Intervention (RTI) team, representative of the instructional and support staff, is assigned to a grade level and meet regularly about students. As concerns arise based on formative assessments and teacher observations, teachers and the RTI team implement instructional and/or behavioral practices to impact student success. For example, Sheltered Instruction Observation Protocol (Echevarria, Vogt & Short, 2004) strategies provide classroom teachers with proven activities to bolster language acquisition among all students in all content areas but specifically for ELL students. All instructional staff are paired with a coach (The Learning Network, 2000). Weekly interactions ranging from modeling lessons, observing lessons, dialoguing and problem solving what isn't working, what should be working, how and why offer a teacher enough support and knowledge to take the necessary risks grow and improve as a teacher.

Students below grade level in reading are enrolled in the Reading Strategies class (Florida Center for Reading Research, 2001), ELL students the Oral Language class (Marie Clay, 1985) and those struggling in

math are placed in the Math Intervention class (NCRI, 2002) in lieu of an extended core selection. Resource teachers (Florida Center for Reading Research, 2001) and paraprofessionals (American Federation of Teachers, 2007) push in to classrooms and target students for additional support.

ACTION STEPS for subgroups

Economically Disadvantaged: Vocabulary (Frayer & Klausmeier, 1969), rubrics (Shirley Clark, 2005), charts and graphs (NCA, 1999), small group instruction (Stiggins, 1987 and Wiggins, 1989), DRA2 (Joetta Beaver, 2007), constructed response (Elsholz & Sperling, 1996)

English Language Learners: Vocabulary (Frayer & Klausmeier, 1969), rubrics (Shirley Clark, 2005), charts and graphs (NCA, 1999), small group instruction (Stiggins, 1987 and Wiggins, 1989), DRA2 (Joetta Beaver, 2007), constructed response (Elsholz & Sperling, 1996)

Students with Disadvantages : Vocabulary (Frayer & Klausmeier, 1969), rubrics (Shirley Clark, 2005), charts and graphs (NCA, 1999), small group instruction (Stiggins, 1987 and Wiggins, 1989), DRA2 (Joetta Beaver, 2007), constructed response (Elsholz & Sperling, 1996)

Gender: Vocabulary (Frayer & Klausmeier, 1969), rubrics (Shirley Clark, 2005), charts and graphs (NCA, 1999), small group instruction (Stiggins, 1987 and Wiggins, 1989), DRA2 (Joetta Beaver, 2007), constructed response (Elsholz & Sperling, 1996)

List of Activities:

Activity	Begin Date	End Date	Staff Responsible
-HL constructed response -Small Group Conferences - Integration of charts and graphs into all content areas -Subgroup Interventions: Math Intervention class Targeted groups Paraprofessionals Extended Day Opportunities RTI SuccessMaker Study Island Tumblebooks The Learning Network	09/07/2010	06/10/2011	Furlow, Department heads, Instructional Coaches

1.1.1.1. Activity: Math

Activity Description: -HL constructed response
 -Small Group Conferences
 -Integration of charts and graphs into all content areas

-Subgroup Interventions:
 Math Intervention class
 Targeted groups
 Paraprofessionals
 Extended Day Opportunities
 RTI
 SuccessMaker
 Study Island
 Tumblebooks

The Learning Network

Activity Type: None

Planned staff responsible for implementing activity: Furlow, Department heads, Instructional Coaches

Actual staff responsible for implementing activity:

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

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

Fiscal Resources Needed for Activity:

Resource	Funding Source	Planned Amount	Actual Amount
Instructional materials such as supplemental books and hands-on manipulatives to build background knowledge and/or reinforce classroom lessons aligned with Math GLCE's and the School Improvement Plan.	Title I Schoolwide	100.00	0.00
Field trips such as the Rouge Plant Tour and the Detroit Science Center and assemblies such as Science Alive reinforce classroom lessons aligned with the GLCE's and School Improvement goals.	Title I Schoolwide	5,650.00	0.00
Parent meeting materials that includes maps, globes, charts, and calculators for parents to support content learning at home, paraprofessional stipend childcare during meetings and substitutes.	Title I Schoolwide	403.50	0.00
Technology to support classroom lessons aligned with Math GLCE's and the School Improvement Plan including two Promethean boards, an Elmo, flip camera, ABDO interactive cross-curricular ebooks, and iMacs. Silver Edition graphing calculators are budgeted from the Stimulus fund (\$4,000).	Title I Schoolwide	27,640.00	0.00
Professional development for curriculum intergration of small group instruction will be provided to all grades by the Walled Lake Building Teams.	Title I Schoolwide	8,300.00	0.00
Summer school tuition and teacher salary.	Title I Schoolwide	3,680.00	0.00
Salary for a teacher and paraprofessional for the Extended Day Program.	Title I Schoolwide	4,750.00	0.00
Staff development materials that includes forty copies of the book Subject Matter and the DVD Comprehending Content.	Title I Schoolwide	1,475.00	0.00
Summer Math MEAP coaches books.	Title I Schoolwide	1,656.00	0.00
Purchased services for staff to support instruction includes substitute teachers, paraprofessionals, and ELL substitute teacher. This also included buses for field trips.	Title I Schoolwide	11,339.00	0.00

Goal 2: Reading

Content Area : English Language Arts

Goal Source : Continuous Improvement

Development Status : Approved

Student Goal Statement : All students will improve their reading comprehension skill by at least one year's growth as evidenced on the D.R.A.

Gap Statement : As evidenced by the MEAP scores the ELL and SE subgroups in seventh and eighth grades scored lower than the AYP target of 54. The ELL scores for seventh grade were 25% below and the eighth grade scores were 9% below AYP. The SE subgroup scores showed that the seventh grade scores were 41% below the AYP target and the eighth grade were 21% lower.

Cause for Gap : It has been determined that the leading causes for the gap in performance for the ELL subgroup is lack of prior knowledge, experiences, academic language, and oral language development. This is often related to the number of years that the students have been attending school in the United States.

The SE subgroup also lacks academic language along with vocabulary development which is due to students' disabilities in reading and language processing. As a result, students have difficulty with reading narrative and expository text, retaining information, and higher level thinking questions.

Unis Middle School did not achieve AYP for the 2009-2010 school year in the area of Reading within the subgroup of students with disabilities. We are aware and planning for the 2010-2011 school year to focus more time on the following;

- to target vocabulary with the support of Success Maker in a study skills class
- to target reading groups by the development of booster groups to support reading strategies
- to increase small group or one-on-one instruction for the SE subgroup by the development of co-teaching which is the combination of general education language arts teacher and the special education teacher collaboration in the classroom for increased achievement
- Instructional coaches will plan and implement with the SE teacher and general education teacher to put into practice all the stated strategies, activities, and interventions from the School Improvement Plan.

Our expectation is that these strategies, activities, and interventions will increase our SE subgroup scores to meet AYP as determined by the state for the 2010-2011 school year.

Multiple measures/sources of data you used to identify this gap in student achievement : D.R.A.

MEAP

SRI

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? The measure of success that will be used to monitor progress include

- a 5% increase in the number of students that meet or exceed MEAP expectations.
- at least one year's growth in the DRA in one year's time.
- 5% increase in the number of students that meet or exceed 80% mastery on the genre assessment.

Professional learning will include

- collaborate to develop common genre assessments with vocabulary, constructed response and graphing components.

- provide collegial support in the classroom with action plans, observations, video taped lessons and dialogue.
- foster an awareness of appropriate oral language development using the Record of Oral Language assessment.

Contact Name : Barranger, Drinkert

List of Objectives:

ID	Objective
4644	All students will demonstrate one year's growth as evidenced by the DRA.

2.1. Objective: Reading

Measurable Objective Statement to Support Goal : All students will demonstrate one year's growth as evidenced by the DRA.

List of Strategies:

ID	Strategy	Locked By
4644	-Teachers will implement literacy, MEAP, and content rubrics. -Teachers will implement vocabulary maps across content areas. -Teachers will use higher level thinking constructed response prompts across the content areas. -Teachers will assess interventions, DRA, SRI, common genre assessments, and assessment portfolios. -Instructional coaches will dialogue with and model for staff.	

2.1.1. Strategy: Reading

Strategy Statement:

- Teachers will implement literacy, MEAP, and content rubrics.
- Teachers will implement vocabulary maps across content areas.
- Teachers will use higher level thinking constructed response prompts across the content areas.
- Teachers will assess interventions, DRA, SRI, common genre assessments, and assessment portfolios.
- Instructional coaches will dialogue with and model for staff.

Selected Target Areas

SAR 3.2 Promotes active involvement of students in the learning process, including opportunities for them to explore application of higher-order thinking skills and investigate new approaches to applying their learning
SAR 4.2 Ensures that student assessment data are used to make decisions for continuous improvement of teaching and learning

Other Required Information for Strategy

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

SIP

Over-arching goals for reading, writing and math gleaned from summative and formative data drive our professional development and instructional practices. Our School Improvement action steps are small group instruction, DRA, constructed response, charts and graphs, rubrics and vocabulary. Improved understandings of instructional approaches, moving from whole to small group (Stiggins, 1987 and Wiggins, 1989) addresses students who "get it" and those who need the lesson's objective presented again, perhaps differently. i.e. Guided reading groups. The DRA formative reading assessment (Joetta Beaver, 2007) assists in student groupings, teaching objectives and text selection for classroom teachers, paraprofessionals and resource teachers. Constructed response (Elsholz and Sperling, 1996) demands high-level reasoning, effective communication of students regardless of the content area. Graphic representation or charts and graphs (NCA, 1999), the interpretation and development is an area of concern for us so we have students interact with charts and graphs in all content areas; physical education and language arts to math, science and social studies. Rubrics, both planning and scoring (Shirley Clark, 2005), provide students with additional support and the staff with a common language. And finally vocabulary, similar to the Frayer Model (Frayer and Klausmeier, 1969), a common approach to vocabulary consistent across the content areas is a powerful reinforcement for students. And again a common language for staff allows for valuable dialogue.

SUB groups

The Response To Intervention (RTI) team, representative of the instructional and support staff, is assigned to a grade level and meet regularly about students. As concerns arise based on formative assessments and teacher observations, teachers and the RTI team implement instructional and/or behavioral practices to impact student success. For example, Sheltered Instruction Observation Protocol (Echevarria, Vogt & Short, 2004) strategies provide classroom teachers with proven activities to bolster language acquisition among all students in all content areas but specifically for ELL students.

Students below grade level in reading are enrolled in the Reading Strategies class (Florida Center for Reading Research, 2001), ELL students the Oral Language class (Marie Clay, 1985) and those struggling in math are placed in the Math Intervention class (NCRI, 2002) in lieu of an extended core selection. Resource teachers (Florida Center for Reading Research, 2001) and paraprofessionals (American Federation of Teachers, 2007) push in to classrooms and target students for additional support. All instructional staff are paired with a coach (The Learning Network, 2000). Weekly interactions ranging from modeling lessons, observing lessons, dialoguing and problem solving what isn't working, what should be working, how and why offer a teacher enough support and knowledge to take the necessary risks to grow and improve as a teacher.

ACTION STEPS for subgroups

Economically Disadvantaged: Vocabulary (Frayer & Klausmeier, 1969), rubrics (Shirley Clark, 2005), charts and graphs (NCA, 1999), small group instruction (Stiggins, 1987 and Wiggins, 1989), DRA2 (Joetta Beaver, 2007), constructed response (Elsholz & Sperling, 1996)

English Language Learners: Vocabulary (Frayer & Klausmeier, 1969), rubrics (Shirley Clark, 2005), charts and graphs (NCA, 1999), small group instruction (Stiggins, 1987 and Wiggins, 1989), DRA2 (Joetta Beaver, 2007), constructed response (Elsholz & Sperling, 1996)

Students with Disadvantages : Vocabulary (Fraye & Klausmeier, 1969), rubrics (Shirley Clark, 2005), charts and graphs (NCA, 1999), small group instruction (Stiggins, 1987 and Wiggins, 1989), DRA2 (Joetta Beaver, 2007), constructed response (Elsholz & Sperling, 1996)

Gender: Vocabulary (Fraye & Klausmeier, 1969), rubrics (Shirley Clark, 2005), charts and graphs (NCA, 1999), small group instruction (Stiggins, 1987 and Wiggins, 1989), DRA2 (Joetta Beaver, 2007), constructed response (Elsholz & Sperling, 1996)

List of Activities:

Activity	Begin Date	End Date	Staff Responsible
-Rubrics -HL constructed response -DRA, SRI -Vocabulary - Subgroup Interventions Reading Strategies ELL Oral Language class Study Skills class SIOP Booster groups Targeted reading groups Paraprofessionals Extended Day Opportunities RTI SuccessMaker Study Island Tumblebooks The Learning Network	09/07/2010	06/10/2011	Barranger, Drinkert, Department Heads, Instructional Coaches

2.1.1.1. Activity: Reading

Activity Description: -Rubrics

-HL constructed response

-DRA, SRI

-Vocabulary

-Subgroup Interventions

Reading Strategies

ELL Oral Language class

Study Skills class

SIOP

Booster groups

Targeted reading groups

Paraprofessionals

Extended Day Opportunities

RTI

SuccessMaker

Study Island

Tumblebooks

The Learning Network

Activity Type: None

Planned staff responsible for implementing activity: Barranger, Drinkert, Department Heads, Instructional Coaches

Actual staff responsible for implementing activity:

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

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

Fiscal Resources Needed for Activity:

Resource	Funding Source	Planned Amount	Actual Amount
Instructional materials such as supplemental books and materials to build background knowledge and/or reinforce classroom lessons aligned with the ELA GLCE's and the School Improvement Plan.	Title I Schoolwide	400.00	0.00
Technology to support classroom lessons aligned with ELA GLCE's and the School Improvement Plan including Elmo's, flip cameras, ABDO interactive cross-curricular ebooks, and iMac computers. Stimulus funds provided additional ABDO interactive science-based ebooks and ABDO graphic novels for reluctant readers in guided reading groups (\$12,800).	Title I Schoolwide	27,990.00	0.00
Salary for a teacher and paraprofessional for the Extended Day Program.	Title I Schoolwide	4,750.00	0.00
Field trips such as Greenfield Village and Wetlands Nature Center and assemblies that includes Understanding Wildlife reinforce classroom lessons aligned with the GLCE's and School Improvement goals.	Title I Schoolwide	5,550.00	0.00
Professional development for curriculum intergration of small group will be provided to all grades by the Walled Lake Building Teams.	Title I Schoolwide	8,300.00	0.00
Summer school tuition and teacher salary.	Title I Schoolwide	3,680.00	0.00
Professional development for the staff provided by The Learning Network which includes program coordinator visits.	Title I Schoolwide	3,500.00	0.00
Staff development materials that includes forty copies of the book What Every Middle School Teacher Shoud Know.	Title I Schoolwide	1,080.00	0.00
Parent meeting materials such as word games, tape recorders, and books for parents to support reading and writing skills at home, paraprofessional stipend childcare during meetings, and substitutes.	Title I Schoolwide	1,821.00	0.00
Summer ELA MEAP coaches books.	Title I Schoolwide	1,656.00	0.00
Purchased services for staff to support instruction includes substitute teachers, paraprofessionals, and ELL substitute teacher. This also includes buses for field trips.	Title I Schoolwide	11,339.00	0.00

Goal 3: Writing

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

Student Goal Statement : All students will improve their writing skills across the curriculum by demonstrating a

one point increase in an identified area of the district 6+1 writing rubric.

Gap Statement : Based on review of our district narrative writing scores, the SE subgroup declined one point on a six point scale in the areas of Conventions and Word Choice. A one point improvement was noted for the Organization and Ideas and Content writing traits.

Cause for Gap : The majority of the students in the SE subgroups are learning disabled which significantly effects their ability to construct and understand written language, as well as their reading comprehension.

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

District common writing assessment; 6+1 Traits of Writing

Local Assessments; monthly writing prompts

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? The measures of success that will be used to monitor progress

-a 5% increase in the number of students that meet or exceed MEAP expectations

-guided writing - 1 point increase in two traits

-independent writing prompt - 1 point increase in two traits

Professional learning include

-implementation of the 6+1 rubric, develop inter-rater reliability via common writing prompts within the school and across the district

-provide collegial support in the classrooms with action plans, observations, video taped lessons and dialogue

-foster an awareness of appropriate oral language development using the Record of Oral Language assessment

Contact Name : Barranger, Drinkert

List of Objectives:

ID	Objective
4663	All students will demonstrate a one point increase in an identified area of the district 6+1 writin

3.1. Objective: Writing

Measurable Objective Statement to Support Goal : All students will demonstrate a one point increase in an identified area of the district 6+1 writin

List of Strategies:

ID	Strategy	Locked By
4663	-Teachers will work collaboratively to develop an implement monthly writing prompts and rubrics. -Teachers will implement vocabulary maps across content areas. -Teachers will use small group conferences for target students, objectives, and oral language development. - Instructional coaches will dialogue with and model for staff. -Teachers will assess interventions,	

writing prompts, utilize 6+1 scoring rubrics, and assessment portfolios.

3.1.1. Strategy: Writing

Strategy Statement: -Teachers will work collaboratively to develop an implement monthly writing prompts and rubrics.

- Teachers will implement vocabulary maps across content areas.
- Teachers will use small group conferences for target students, objectives, and oral language development.
- Instructional coaches will dialogue with and model for staff.
- Teachers will assess interventions, writing prompts, utilize 6+1 scoring rubrics, and assessment portfolios.

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 4.2 Develops and implements a comprehensive assessment system for assessing progress toward meeting the expectations for student learning

Other Required Information for Strategy

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

SIP

Over-arching goals for reading, writing and math gleaned from summative and formative data drive our professional development and instructional practices. Our School Improvement action steps are small group instruction, DRA, constructed response, charts and graphs, rubrics and vocabulary. Improved understandings of instructional approaches, moving from whole to small group (Stiggins, 1987 and Wiggins, 1989) addresses students who "get it" and those who need the lesson's objective presented again, perhaps differently. i.e. Guided reading groups. The DRA formative reading assessment (Joetta Beaver, 2007) assists in student groupings, teaching objectives and text selection for classroom teachers, paraprofessionals and resource teachers. Constructed response (Elsholz and Sperling, 1996) demands high-level reasoning, effective communication of students regardless of the content area. Graphic representation or charts and graphs (NCA, 1999), the interpretation and development is an area of concern for us so we have students interact with charts and graphs in all content areas; physical education and language arts to math, science and social studies. Rubrics, both planning and scoring (Shirley Clark, 2005), provide students with additional support and the staff with a common language. And finally vocabulary, similar to the Frayer Model (Frayer and Klausmeier, 1969), a common approach to vocabulary consistent across the content areas is a powerful reinforcement for students. And again a common language for staff allows for valuable dialogue. All instructional staff are paired with a coach (The Learning Network, 2000). Weekly interactions ranging from modeling lessons, observing lessons, dialoguing and problem solving what isn't working, what should be working, how and why offer a teacher enough support and knowledge to take the necessary risks grow and improve as a teacher.

SUBgroups

The Response To Intervention (RTI) team, representative of the instructional and support staff, is assigned

to a grade level and meet regularly about students. As concerns arise based on formative assessments and teacher observations, teachers and the RTI team implement instructional and/or behavioral practices to impact student success. For example, Sheltered Instruction Observation Protocol (Echevarria, Vogt & Short, 2004) strategies provide classroom teachers with proven activities to bolster language acquisition among all students in all content areas but specifically for ELL students. Students below grade level in reading may qualify for booster groups (Karla MacKenzie, 2001) or the Oral Language class (Marie Clay, 1985). Resource teachers (Florida Center for Reading Research, 2001) and paraprofessionals (American Federation of Teachers, 2007) push in to classrooms and target students for additional support area.

ACTION STEPS for subgroups

Economically Disadvantaged: Vocabulary (Frayer & Klausmeier, 1969), rubrics (Shirley Clark, 2005), charts and graphs (NCA, 1999), small group instruction (Stiggins, 1987 and Wiggins, 1989), DRA2 (Joetta Beaver, 2007), constructed response (Elsholz & Sperling, 1996)

English Language Learners: Vocabulary (Frayer & Klausmeier, 1969), rubrics (Shirley Clark, 2005), charts and graphs (NCA, 1999), small group instruction (Stiggins, 1987 and Wiggins, 1989), DRA2 (Joetta Beaver, 2007), constructed response (Elsholz & Sperling, 1996)

Students with Disadvantages : Vocabulary (Frayer & Klausmeier, 1969), rubrics (Shirley Clark, 2005), charts and graphs (NCA, 1999), small group instruction (Stiggins, 1987 and Wiggins, 1989), DRA2 (Joetta Beaver, 2007), constructed response (Elsholz & Sperling, 1996)

Gender: Vocabulary (Frayer & Klausmeier, 1969), rubrics (Shirley Clark, 2005), charts and graphs (NCA, 1999), small group instruction (Stiggins, 1987 and Wiggins, 1989), DRA2 (Joetta Beaver, 2007), constructed response (Elsholz & Sperling, 1996)

List of Activities:

Activity	Begin Date	End Date	Staff Responsible
-rubrics -vocabulary -small group conferences -Subgroup Interventions Reading Strategies class ELL Oral Language Class SIOP Study Skills class Booster Groups Targeted Reading groups Paraprofessionals Extended Day Opportunities RTI SuccessMaker Study Island Tumblebooks The Learning Network	09/07/2010	06/10/2011	Barranger, Drinkert, Department Heads, Instructional Coaches

3.1.1.1. Activity: Writing

- Activity Description:** -rubrics
 -vocabulary
 -small group conferences

 -Subgroup Interventions
 Reading Strategies class
 ELL Oral Language Class

SIOP
 Study Skills class
 Booster Groups
 Targeted Reading groups
 Paraprofessionals
 Extended Day Opportunities
 RTI
 SuccessMaker
 Study Island
 Tumblebooks
 The Learning Network

Activity Type: None

Planned staff responsible for implementing activity: Barranger, Drinkert, Department Heads, Instructional Coaches

Actual staff responsible for implementing activity:

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

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

Fiscal Resources Needed for Activity:

Resource	Funding Source	Planned Amount	Actual Amount
Instructional materials such as supplemental books and materials to build background knowledge and/or reinforce classroom lessons aligned with the ELA GLCE's and the School Improvement Plan.	Title I Schoolwide	400.00	0.00
Technology to support classroom lessons aligned with ELA GLCE's and the School Improvement Plan including Elmo's, flip cameras, ABDO interactive cross-curricular ebooks, and iMac computers. Stimulus funds provided additional materials such as RESA's WriteWell resources (\$1,200).	Title I Schoolwide	16,390.00	0.00
Salary for a teacher and paraprofessional for the Extended Day Program.	Title I Schoolwide	4,750.00	0.00
Field trips such as iMax Theater and Greenfield Village and assemblies such as Science Alive reinforce classroom lessons aligned with the GLCE's and the School Improvement goals.	Title I Schoolwide	5,550.00	0.00
Professional development for curriculum integration of small group will be provided to all grades by Walled Lake Building Teams.	Title I Schoolwide	8,300.00	0.00
Summer school tuition and teacher salary.	Title I Schoolwide	3,680.00	0.00
Professional development for the staff provided by The Learning Network which includes program coordinator visits.	Title I Schoolwide	3,500.00	0.00
Parent meeting materials such as white boards and journals for parents to support writing skills at home, paraprofessional stipend childcare	Title I Schoolwide	1,407.00	0.00

during meetings, and substitutes.			
Summer ELA MEAP coaches books.	Title I Schoolwide	1,656.00	0.00
Purchased services for staff to support instruction which includes substitute teachers, paraprofessional, and ELL substitute teacher. This also includes buses for field trips.	Title I Schoolwide	11,339.00	0.00

Resource Profile

Funding Source	Planned Amount	Actual Amount
Title I Schoolwide	\$192,031.50	\$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
Mrs.	Rita	Rauch	Principal	rauchr@dearborn.k12.mi.us
Mrs.	Gretchen	Bajorek	Instructional Coach	bajoreg@dearborn.k12.mi.us
Mrs.	Kellie	Bugajski	Instructional Coach	bugajsk@dearborn.k12.mi.us
Mrs.	Mary Ann	Krengel	Instructional Coach	krengem@dearborn.k12.mi.us
Mrs.	Anne Marie	Walters	Instructional Coach	waltera@dearborn.k12.mi.us
Mrs.	Tracy	Thompson	Teacher	thompst@dearborn.k12.mi.us
Mr.	Steve	Drinkert	Teacher	drinkes@dearborn.k12.mi.us
Mrs.	Kristen	Farkas	Teacher	farkask@dearborn.k12.mi.us
Ms.	April	Kincaid	Teacher	kincaia@dearborn.k12.mi.us
Mrs.	Allison	Wancha	Teacher	wanchaa@dearborn.k12.mi.us
Mrs.	Teresa	Mullins	Parent	*
Mrs.	Jean	Joseph	Community Volunteer	*
Mrs.	Fadwa	Sareini	Parent	sareinif@dearborn.k12.mi.us
Mrs.	Mona	Haidar	Parent	*
Ms.	Nancy	Wilkie	Counselor	wilkien@dearborn.k12.mi.us
Mrs.	Reema	Haugen	Bilingual Resource Teache	haugenr@dearborn.k12.mi.us

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

To involve the stakeholders the plan is designed to actively involve parents/community in student learning through annual parent, teacher, and student surveys and the following;

- Family Literacy Night (March 22, 2010)
- Home visits (as needed)
- Parent meetings evaluations for each month(Sept, 2009-May, 2010)
- School Improvement Committee Meetings (monthly)
- Parent phone calls (as needed)
- Guest readers during March is Reading month (March, 2010)
- Chaperoning field trips and assemblies (monthly)
- Summer MEAP materials (June, 2010)
- Variety of materials distributed to parents; books, science and math materials (distributed at each monthly parent meeting; Sept, 2009-May 2010)

- Parent classroom volunteers (as needed)
- Book fair volunteers (Nov, 2009 & May, 2010)
- Parent Connect (daily)
- High school community service volunteers
- District Parent Advisory committee (PAC)(Oct, 2009 & Jan 2010)

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

The plan is designed to actively involve parents/community in the decision making at the building by;

- PTSA (Parent Teacher Student Association)
- Parent surveys (Spring, 2009)
- School Improvement committee representative (meets every month during the school year)
- District committees
- Monthly parent meeting evaluations (distributed and collected at each meeting)

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

There are many types of family/community participation/engagement that are in place to support student achievement. This includes communication that is;

designed to encourage two way communication

- Open House (Sept. 24, 2009)
- Parent-teacher conferences (Oct 27th & Oct 29th, 2009 & Mar 25th, 2010)
- Grade level team meetings that include meeting with parents (as needed)
- Student planners (daily)
- Parent/Teacher/Student Compacts (Oct 27th & Oct 29th, 2009)
- Phone calls (as needed)
- Email (as needed)
- IEPs (once a year, MET every 3 years)
- MEAP conferences (May, 2010)
- Monthly parent meetings (Sept, 2009- May, 2010)
- Parent meetings - "Coffee with the Principal"
- translators are always available

designed as one way communication

- website (on-going)
- school newsletters (monthly; Sept, 2009-June, 2010)
- notes sent home (as needed per classroom teachers)
- translation of information (available daily)

designed to increase parent education

- monthly parent meetings; reading to your child, healthy snacks, fire safety, bullying, responsibility, nutrition, dental health, math skills, science skills (Sept, 2009-May, 2010)
- Home visits (as needed)
- District parent liaison
- Bilingual Resource teacher and bilingual interpreters
- translation of information (available daily & for home visits)

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:

Brian Whiston, Superintendent

Address:

18700 Audette Dearborn, MI 48124

Telephone Number:

313-827-3000

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?

High Quality Professional Development

The professional development plan and activities are data driven and selected based on the academic gaps we find in the multiple assessments we administer to students. The ultimate purpose of providing systematic professional development opportunities to staff is to improve teachers' competence in best practices, assessment and content knowledge. This in turn will lead to improving student academic achievement and narrowing any achievement gaps we identify among the subgroup. Our professional development plan is focused on specific areas identified when conducting item analyses of MEAP and common assessments. Staff development is on site and job embedded, provided through several delivery modes:

1. Collaborative teaching between classroom teachers and Title I/Bilingual resource teachers. Unis resource teachers and classroom teachers share instruction in the classroom by utilizing small group and individual instructional opportunities in all curriculum areas.
2. Coaching by instructional coaches using The Learning Network Model. The Learning Network Model is a professional development model based upon the research of Caine and Caine 1997, Anderson and Walberg 1994, Wang, Haertel, Walberg 1998, Vygotsky 1978, Clay 1991 & 1993 all of which is currently included in the publication prepared by NSDC and NEA entitled What Works for Elementary and Secondary Schools. In The Learning Network model at Unis each coach supports a specific grade level and/or content area. The instructional coach observes classroom teachers doing lessons of his/her choice (math, social studies, science, reading/writing) that is directly aligned to our needs assessment and school improvement goals. A dialogue session follows where the discussion between the coach and classroom teacher centers around the following aspects of teaching and learning:
 - teaching learning cycle
 - the conditions for learning
 - the reading process
 - the writing process
 - the three levels of support in a well balanced classroom (demonstration, shared, independent)
 - Critical Aspects of Learning (CAL)
 - Narrative & Expository Elements

One goal of the model is to provide opportunities for teachers to work collaboratively and problem solve together during the school day. The observation and dialogue model is a support to teachers that gives a fresh pair of eyes to help problem solve a critical aspect of learning. Another goal of The Learning Network model is to bring staff to new understandings that will underpin their classroom practices. The support and professional development is on going throughout the school year by way of weekly (sometimes daily) classroom visits by the coaches. Often coaches will model best practices and then give support when the teacher is trying the lesson for his/herself. The coach can co-teach with the classroom teacher while something new is being attempted. Often the coach will find resources and help to plan for lessons. The instructional coach is available to support the classroom teachers in whatever way possible in order to achieve the goals in the Unis school improvement plan. Those goals are a direct reflection of our comprehensive needs assessments.

Additionally, teachers will have professional development throughout the 2009-2010 school year either through district or building level plans. Building professional development will be offered in the following areas:

- Teaching & Learning cycle
- School climate
- Marzano strategies
- MEAP changes
- Vocabulary/word usage
- Sheltered Instruction Observation Protocol (SIOP)
- Daily 5
- Professional Learning Communities (PLC)

Also, offered by the district's Compensatory Education Department are sessions called 6-Star Saturdays that run from 8:45 - 1:00. The schedule for 2009-2010 is:

- November 7, 2009 - Blueprint for Writing
- February 27, 2010 - Thinking Map Strategies
- March 20, 2010 - Parent/Teacher talk
- April 24, 2010 - Oral Language Strategies

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

Fiscal resources have been integrated to support the math, reading, and writing goals. These resource include; supplemental books and materials to build background knowledge and/or reinforce classroom lessons aligned with GLCE's, field trips, parent meeting materials, assemblies, and professional development on curriculum intergration of small group instruction.

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

The teacher, parent, and student surveys assessed the need for technology intergration to support school improvement goals. The promethean boards, moblie laptops, and classroom computers support reading, math, and writing skill development.