

SCHOOL IMPROVEMENT PLAN

McKinley Middle Magnet School

East Baton Rouge Parish School System

School Improvement and Planning Section
Division of School Standards, Accountability, and Assistance
Louisiana Department of Education

Initial Submission Date: May 10, 2005

McKinley Middle Magnet School

6 - 8

1557 McCalop Street
Baton Rouge, Louisiana 70802

Joyce Green-Graham

225.388.0089

jgraham2@ebrschools.org

Check where applicable:

- Louisiana Approved School
- Charter School
- Alternative School
- School in School Improvement
- School with Comprehensive School Reform Demonstration
- Title I School Schoolwide Targeted Assistance
- Member of Southern Association of Colleges and Schools
- Grant Application

Name of Grant: _____

Contact Person: _____

Phone: _____

Email: _____

Signature of Principal: _____

Date: _____

Signature of Superintendent: _____

Date: _____

Directions on What to Submit to the LDE and How to Complete the *Template Checklist*

- ❑ For schools in School Improvement, submit the plan with the state's Rubric *for the Evaluation of School Improvement Plans Summary Report* on disk to the designated division of the LDE.
- ❑ Mail the Cover Page, District Assurance, Faculty Assurance, and any non-electronic data attachments along with the plan on disk.
- ❑ Place requested data attachments in electronic form on the disk numbered and ordered as in Table of Contents.
- ❑ Mail any other non-electronic material, such as that required by SACS, entitlements, or grants, in a logical sequence with an appropriate cover page, numbered pages, and references in the Table of Contents.
- ❑ Use 11-point font.
- ❑ For any school in School Improvement and/or with Comprehensive School Reform Program (CSRP) grant, check applicable categories on the Cover Page of the *School Improvement Plan*.
- ❑ Update page numbers in the Table of Contents.
- ❑ For SIPs that have been revised, indicate material that has changed on the Strategy Planning Worksheet with lines (strikethroughs) typed through it. Place revisions in bold after the strikethroughs.
- ❑ For any completed activity, write the word *completed* in parenthesis following the strikethroughs.
- ❑ If any item/activity is incomplete, explain in a brief note in parenthesis why the activity was not completed.
- ❑ For grant applications, place in bold Activities and Action Steps for targeted funding should the grant be awarded. Include the title of the grant as well as the name, address, and phone number of the contact person on the Cover Page of the *School Improvement Plan*.
- ❑ USE BLUE INK for original signatures.
 - ❑ Principal's Signature
 - ❑ Superintendent's Signature
 - ❑ DAT Members' Signatures
 - ❑ School Improvement Team Chair's Signature

**Schools submit SIPs to the district for evaluation using the state's rubric.*

TABLE OF CONTENTS

DISTRICT ASSURANCE.....	4
ASSURANCE OF FACULTY REVIEW OF SCHOOL IMPROVEMENT PLAN.....	4
MISSION STATEMENT	4
SCHOOL DEMOGRAPHICS/CHARACTERISTICS	4
SUMMARY REPORT OF STUDENT ACHIEVEMENT DATA.....	4
SUMMARY REPORT OF STUDENT ATTENDANCE AND DROPOUT DATA.....	4
DATA COMPREHENSIVE NEEDS ASSESSMENT: SUMMARY REPORT	4
STRATEGY PLANNING WORKSHEET	4
STRATEGY PLANNING WORKSHEET.....	4
RESEARCH RATIONALE FOR STRATEGIES.....	4
TOTAL SCHOOL BUDGET FOR RESTRICTED AND DISCRETIONARY FUNDS	4
BUDGET WORKSHEET BY ACHIEVEMENT GOAL AND FUNDING SOURCE.....	4
DATA ATTACHMENTS.....	4
o School Accountability Report Cards (Parent and Principal)	
o Summary of Findings of Survey Data (Teachers, Parents, Students, and Principal)	
o Summary of Findings of Interview Data (Principal, Counselor, Students, Teachers) (Not Optional for Schools in School Improvement/CSRP)	
o Summary of Findings of Focus Group Data (Teachers, Students, Parents) (Not Optional for Schools in School Improvement/CSRP)	
o Data Triangulation Form or SAM 2000 Vote-Counting Method: Strength/Weakness Summary Sheet	
o Comprehensive Needs Assessment: Final Report	
o Data Notebook (for schools participating in School Analysis Model-SAM 2000)	
o Special Education Monitoring Report (district level)	
o Other Pertinent Data (other IOWA summary data, ACT summaries, PSAT summaries, etc.)	

DISTRICT ASSURANCE

- For schools in School Improvement, and for schools with CSRP models, I hereby certify that this plan was developed with the assistance of a District Assistance Team in collaboration with the School Improvement Team and/or School Support Team, as applicable.
- I hereby certify that this plan was designed to improve student achievement, with input from all stakeholders.
- I assure that the school level personnel, including subgroup representatives responsible for implementation of this plan, have collaborated in the writing of the plan.
- I hereby certify that this plan has all of the following components as required for schools identified to be in School Improvement:
 - A statement of the school's mission
 - A comprehensive needs assessment, which includes the following quantitative and qualitative data:
 - Student academic performances on standardized achievement tests (both CRT, NRT, and LAA)
 - Demographic indicators of the community and school to include socioeconomic factors
 - School human and material resource summary, to include teacher demographic indicators
 - Interviews with principals and teachers
 - Student and teacher focus groups
 - Questionnaires with stakeholders (principals, teachers, students, parents) measuring conceptual domains outlined in school effectiveness/reform research
 - Classroom observations
 - Goals and measurable objectives
 - Scientifically research-based methods, strategies, and activities that guide curriculum content, instruction, and assessment
 - Professional development components aligned with assessed needs
 - Parental and community involvement activities aligned with assessed needs
 - Evaluation strategies that include methods to measure progress of implementation
 - Coordination of resources and analysis of school budget (possible redirection of funds)
 - An action plan with timelines and specific activities for implementing the above criteria
- I further certify that the information contained in this assurance is true and correct to the best of my knowledge.

Superintendent's signature (in blue ink)

Principal's signature (in blue ink)

Assistant Superintendent's signature (in blue ink)

Chair, School Improvement Team (in blue ink)

District Assistance Team Leader (in blue ink)

District Assistance Team Member (in blue ink)

District Assistance Team Member (in blue ink)

District Assistance Team Member (in blue ink)

Not Applicable (No District Assistance Team in place)

ASSURANCE OF FACULTY REVIEW OF SCHOOL IMPROVEMENT PLAN

Total Faculty & Staff in School: **Click to Enter Number**

Date: **Click to Enter Date**

The following *faculty* members have reviewed the School Improvement Plan and have discussed their part in implementing it.

	NAME	TITLE	SIGNATURE (in blue ink)	SIGNATURE DATE
1	Click to Enter Name; Tab to Move to Next Cell	Click to Enter Title		
2				
3				
4				
5				
6				
7				
8				
9				
10				
11				
12				
13				
14				
15				Tab to Create More Lines; Delete Message Before Printing

Date _____

MISSION STATEMENT

Every student at McKinley Middle Magnet will achieve academic excellence

List the names and occupations of those persons who participated in developing the mission statement:

Joyce Graham, Principal

Joe Sullivan, Asst. Principal

E'Van Smith, Magnet Coordinator

Saleria Blue, Technology Teacher

Felicity Amond, Mathematics Teacher

Katrina Stribling, Parent

Alexandria Moore, Student

Annette Viator, LSU/McKinley Partnership Coordinator

SCHOOL DEMOGRAPHICS/CHARACTERISTICS

A D M		Total #	# Certified	# Expected Vacancies	# in LA Principal Internship/Induction Program for SY 04-05
	Principals				

T E A C H E R S *		School Non-Title I		Title I				Total % in School		% Change from 2004	
				Schoolwide		Targeted Assistance					
	HIGHLY QUALIFIED*	General Ed	Special Ed	General Ed	Special Ed	General Ed	Special Ed	Genera l Ed	Specia l Ed	Genera l Ed	Specia l Ed
	# Highly Qualified Core Academic Teachers (Subtotal)										
	NOT HIGHLY QUALIFIED	General Ed	Special Ed	General Ed	Special Ed	General Ed	Special Ed	Genera l Ed	Specia l Ed	Genera l Ed	Specia l Ed
	Non-Standard *** (TAT) (OFAT) (TEP) (EP)										
	Other										
	Subtotal Not Highly Qualified										
TOTAL TEACHERS (Highly Qualified and Not Highly Qualified)											
P A R A S	HIGHLY QUALIFIED*	General Ed	Special Ed	General Ed	Special Ed	General Ed	Special Ed	Genera l Ed	Specia l Ed	Genera l Ed	Specia l Ed
	# Highly Qualified Paras										
	NOT HIGHLY QUALIFIED	General Ed	Special Ed	General Ed	Special Ed	General Ed	Special Ed	Genera l Ed	Specia l Ed	Genera l Ed	Specia l Ed
	# Not Highly Qualified Paras										
TOTAL PARAS (Highly Qualified and Not Highly Qualified)											

* Teachers include all teaching in core academic courses (English/Reading/Language Arts; Math; Science; Civics/Government; Economics; Arts; History' Geography)

** Highly Qualified: Has met all requirements as specified by the La. Board of Elementary and Secondary Education's definition of "Highly Qualified" under NCLB adopted June 19, 2003. (Copy provided under Consolidated Application Resource section on DOE website).

*** Temporary Authority to Teach (TAT); Out-of-Field Authorization to Teach (OFAT); Temporary Employment Permit (TEP); Emergency Permit (EP)

School Support	
School Improvement Team Members	Position
Joyce Graham	Principal
Joe Sullivan	Asst. Principal
E'Van Smith	Magnet Coordinator
Saleria Blue	Technology Teacher
Robert Webb	Parent
Katrina Stribling	Parent
Alexandria Moore	Student
Annette Viator	LSU/McKinley Partnership Coordinator

District Assistance Team Leader: Gladys White	Contact #: 922 5400
Distinguished Educator: N/A	Contact #: N/A
Parish Homeless Liaison: Carolyn Coleman	Contact #: 225.357.4255

Learning-Intensive Networking Communities for Success (LINCS) Information (if applicable)	
Regional LINCS Coordinator	N/A
Content Leader(s)	N/A
Content Area of Focus for School	N/A
High Schools That Work (HSTW) Site Coordinator and Contact #	N/A
Making Middle Grades Work (MMGW) Site Coordinator and Contact #	N/A
Leadership Team Members/Position at School	N/A

Federal/State Instructional Programs and/or Initiatives

(Place a check or X in the status area for each program implemented at your school)

Program List: (including during and after school programs)	Currently Using	Proposed Program	Deleted Program
21 st Century Community Learning Centers			
Big Buddy			
Career to Work			
DARE			
Early Reading First			
HIPPY			
INTECH			
INTECH 2 Science			
INTECH Social Studies			
K-3 Reading/Math Initiative			
La GEAR-UP			
La SIP	X		
LEAD TECH			
Learning Intensive Networking Communities for Success (LINCS)			
LINCS/High School That Work (HSTW)			
LINCS/Making Middle Grades Work (MMGW)			
Louisiana Virtual School			
Making Middle Grades Work			
SAGE			
School Tech			
School to Work			
School wide Positive Behavior Interventions and Support			
The Louisiana Literacy Corps			
The Multisensory Structured Language Program			
The Strategic Instruction Model (SIM)			
Other: Compass, Math Initiative, LEAP Tutoring	X		

List Supplemental Educational Services provided for your students (Title I schools, if applicable):

- N/A

List the Distance Learning (i.e., web-based, satellite, etc.) courses provided for your students:

- N/A

School Policies		
Policy	Yes	No
Discipline Policy	X	
Security Procedures (metal detectors, etc.)	X	
Safe and Drug-Free Prevention Activities	X	
Student Code of Conduct	X	
Crisis Management (emergency/evacuation plan)	X	

School Partnerships (Place the name of each partner in the space provided)	
University	Louisiana State University
Technical Institute	
Feeder School(s)	Westdale Heights, Forest Heights, BR Performing Arts, South Blvd.
Community	Louisiana Fundraisers
Business/Industry	
Private Grants	
Other	

STUDENT DATA

Student Information								
List the number of students in each area								
Total at School	# of Grade 4 and above	Students with Disabilities	Gifted and Talented	504	Option III	LEP	Homeless	Migrant
404	0	16	0		0	10		0

Number of Households Served by School	269
--	-----

% of Students in Subgroups by Ethnicity				
Other	Asian/Pacific Islander	Black	Hispanic	White
1.7	.7	93.6	1.0	3.0

Poverty Profile	
# of Free/Reduced Lunch Students: 318	Percent of Free/Reduced Lunch Students: 73.78

SUMMARY REPORT OF STUDENT ACHIEVEMENT DATA

WHOLE SCHOOL SPS: CRT Trend Data

Index Category	2000 Index	2001 Index	2002 Index	2003 Index	2004 Index	Avg. # Students	Index Goal for next year*
English/Language Arts							
• 8 th Grade CRT Index: ELA	85.4	78.2	66.4	67.5	61.2	188.2	67.1
— School CRT Index: ELA	85.4	78.2	66.4	67.5	61.2	188.2	67.1
Math							
□ 8 th Grade CRT Index: Math	60.8	54.4	46.7	47.6	50	188	57
□ School CRT Index: Math	60.8	54.4	46.7	47.6	50	188	57
Science							
□ 8 th Grade CRT Index: Science	66.7	66.7	65.2	52.4	51.9	187.1	58.7
• School CRT Index: Science	66.7	66.7	65.2	52.4	51.9	187.1	58.7
Social Studies							
• 8 th Grade CRT Index: Social Studies	77.5	76.0	60.8	56.9	55.6	187.1	62.1
• School CRT Index: Social Studies	77.5	76.0	60.8	56.9	55.6	187.1	62.1
All Subjects							
• 8 th Grade CRT Index: All Subjects	72.6	68.8	59.8	56.1	54.7	749.65	61.2
• School CRT Index: All Subjects	72.6	68.8	59.8	56.1	54.7	749.65	61.2

*Use Index Goal values when writing objectives for any particular index category.

WHOLE SCHOOL SPS: NRT Trend Data

Index Category	2000 Index	2001 Index	2002 Index	2003 Index	2004 Index	Avg. # Students	Index Goal for next year*
Grade 6							
• Reading Index	49.6	56.4	56.9	42.4	37.6	183.6	45.8
• Language Index				58.1	58.5	190.4	64.7
• Math Index	60.5	60.1	66.5	49.2	46.8	183.5	54.1
• Science Index	52.6	58.0	63.3	40.9	38.8	183.6	46.9
• Social Studies Index	54.2	60.5	55.4	51.9	48	183.6	55.2
Composite Index	61.9	62.1	63.5	49.3	46.1	183.6	53.5
Grade 7							
• Reading Index	66.3	51.0	58.1	49.8	52.9	181.8	59.6
• Language Index				70.9	62.9	190.4	68.6
• Math Index	71.6	59.5	60.4	57.5	60.7	181.2	66.6
• Science Index	71.3	56.0	58.2	59.2	54.5	180.8	61.1
• Social Studies Index	60.4	64.8	53.6	66.0	62.7	181.2	68.4
• Composite Index	71.3	61.5	61.0	60.8	57.9	181.8	64.1

*Use Index Goal values when writing objectives for any particular index category.

SUBGROUP: % Proficient Trend Data (Grade 8)

Index Category	2000	2001	2002	2003	2004	Avg. # Students	Goal for next year*
ELA – Grade 8							
• School	60.3	51.8	35.0	44.2	44.8	181	50.32
• Indian							
• Asian							
• Black	54.1	49.7	30.1	40.4	44.4	171	49.96
• Hispanic							
• White	91.7	88.9	75.0	81.3		15.25	
• Limited English Proficient							
• Poverty	45.5	42.8	29.7	39.5	42.8	137.75	48.52
• Students with Disabilities	0	4.0	15.0	16.7	12	18.75	20.8
Math – Grade 8							
• School	46.6	40.9	29.0	38.3	40	181	46
• Indian							
• Asian							
• Black	37.6	37.6	23.3	32.4	38.4	171	44.56
• Hispanic							
• White	87.5	88.9	75.0	81.3		15.25	
• Limited English Proficient							
• Poverty	28.2	29.7	22.7	30.6	40.7	137.75	46.63
• Students with Disabilities	0	4.0	5.0	41.7	24	18.75	31.6

*Use Proficiency Goal values when writing objectives for any particular index category.

SUMMARY REPORT OF STUDENT ATTENDANCE AND DROPOUT DATA

WHOLE SCHOOL SPS: Attendance and Dropout Trend Data							
Index Category	2000 Index	2001 Index	2002 Index	2003 Index	2004 Index	Avg. # Students	Index Goal for next year*
Attendance Index	71.6	49.7	70.0	71.6		NA	
Dropout Index	65.0	36.0	105.0	150.0		NA	

*Use Index Goal values when writing objectives for any particular index category.

Summary of Student Suspension and Expulsion

Suspension Rate (Number of Students / %)							
Grade	1999-2000	2000-01	2001-02	2002-03	2003-04	2004-05	2005-06
Grade							
Grade							
Grade							
Grade							
Total Suspension Rate	74/10.9	0/0.0	0/0.0	192/24.8			

Expulsion Rate (Number of Students / %)							
Grade	1999-2000	2000-01	2001-02	2002-03	2003-04	2004-05	2005-06
Grade							
Grade							
Grade							
Grade							
Total Expulsion Rate	0/0.0	0/0.0	0/0.0	~			

Summary of Special Education Student Suspension and Expulsion

Suspension Rate (Number of Students / %)								
Grade	1999-2000	2000-01	2001-02	2002-03	2003-04	2004-05	2005-06	
Grade	Not Available							
Grade								
Grade								
Grade								
Total Suspension Rate								

Expulsion Rate (Number of Students / %)								
Grade	1999-2000	2000-01	2001-02	2002-03	2003-04	2004-05	2005-06	
Grade	Not Available							
Grade								
Grade								
Grade								
Total Expulsion Rate								

SPS – WHOLE SCHOOL TREND DATA ANALYSIS

This document presents some suggested steps for evaluating SPS data across several years. The steps do not cover all possible data analyses, but are intended to help uncover potential target areas for school improvement.

Step 1: *Identify weakest area for current year*

- Look for the lowest index score across all areas (NRT, CRT, Attendance, and Dropout) for the current year.
- NOTE: This “current weakness” could be caused by a variety of factors (ex: “good class/bad class” syndrome) and may not necessarily reflect an immediate school improvement concern for the school.
- If the current year lowest index score has been low for the past few years (ex: 2000-2004), then it should be noted as a potential weakness.

Step 2: *Identify any declining trends*

- Look for indexes that have declined over the past year or two.
- NOTE: Some declining trends may be the result of population shifts and may not necessarily reflect problematic areas.
- If any index has steadily or substantially declined over recent years, then it should be noted as a potential weakness.

Step 3: *Identify any grade level weaknesses*

- Compare grade level academic indexes (NRT, CRT) and evaluate grade level performance (ex: Does one grade have substantially lower indexes than all other grades?).
- NOTE: Be sure to look at data across all years before concluding that a grade level weakness exists.
- If any grade level index is consistently lower than other grade indexes in the school, then it should be noted as a potential weakness.

Step 4: *Identify any subject level weaknesses*

- Compare CRT indexes by subject to NRT indexes that relate to that same subject (ex: compare CRT Math index to NRT Math Total index).
- Low index scores across grades within a particular subject should be noted as a potential weakness.
- Low scores in some grades and high scores in other grades in the same subject may also indicate grade level weaknesses within a particular subject (which should be noted along with other grade level findings in Step 3).

% PROFICIENT - SUBGROUP TREND DATA ANALYSIS

Step 5: *Identify weakest area for current year by subgroup*

- Look for the lowest % Proficient score across all subgroups (Indian, Asian, Black, Hispanic, White, LEP, Poverty, and Special Education) for the current year for both ELA and Math.
- If the current year lowest % Proficient score has been low for the past few years (ex: 2000-2004), then it should be noted as a potential weakness.

Step 6: *Identify any declining trends for subgroups*

- Look for subgroup % Proficient scores in ELA and/or Math that have declined over the past few years.
- NOTE: Some declining trends may be the result of population shifts and may not necessarily reflect problematic areas.
- If any subgroup % Proficient scores have steadily or substantially declined over the past few years, then it should be noted as a potential weakness.

Step 7: *Identify achievement gap issues*

- Compare each subgroup's % Proficient scores to the Whole School or other subgroup % Proficient scores in ELA and Math and evaluate subgroup performance (ex: Are any subgroups consistently below the Whole School proficiency score in ELA and/or Math?)
- NOTE: Be sure to look at data across all years before concluding that a subgroup weakness exists.
- If any subgroup % Proficient score is consistently or substantially lower than the Whole School or other subgroup % Proficient scores then it should be noted as a potential weakness.

Step 8: *Identify any subject level weaknesses by subgroup*

- Compare Math % Proficient scores to ELA % Proficient scores (ex: Is one subject typically higher than the other subject for the subgroups?)
- Low % Proficient scores ACROSS subgroups within a particular subject should be noted as a potential school wide weakness in that subject.
- Low % Proficient scores in ELA or Math for any subgroup across 2-3 years should be noted as a potential subject-level weakness for that subgroup.

Step 9: *Determine major SPS and subgroup weaknesses for school*

- Analyze and discuss all potential weaknesses from steps 1 through 8 and determine 2 or 3 major SPS and/or subgroup weaknesses.

Trend Analysis

List the trends identified across the LEAP 21 (CRT) data.

1. Decline in ELA from 85.4 in 2000 to 61.2 in 2004.
2. Decline in Math from 60.8 in 2000 to 50.0 in 2004.
3. Consistent downward trend in Science from 66.7 in 2001 to 51.9 in 2004 and in Social Studies from 77.5 in 2000 to 55.6 in 2004.

List the trends identified across the ITBS (NRT) data.

1. Inconsistent pattern for ELA 6th and 7th grades from 2000-2004.
2. Inconsistent pattern for Math 6th and 7th grades from 2000-2004.
3. Inconsistent pattern for Social Studies and Science 6th and 7th grades from 2000-2004.

List the trends across the Subgroup Percent Proficient data.

1. Sharp decline in Black 8th grade in ELA and Math from 2000 to 2002 with a consistent increase from 2002 to 2004.
2. Steady decline in White 8th grade in ELA and Math from 2000 to 2002 with an increase from 2002-2003.
3. Sharp increase in students with disabilities 8th grade in ELA and Math.

List the trends across the Student Attendance and/or Dropout data.

1. Dropout index at goal during 2003; with a decrease in 2004.
2. Steady rise in attendance goals.

Note: Refer to Summary Report of Student Achievement Data Sheets.

DATA COMPREHENSIVE NEEDS ASSESSMENT: SUMMARY REPORT

For Title I Schools: ELA and Math by subgroups should be primary when considering weaknesses that will lead to the goals in the SIP.

Rank-order the identified areas of strength (3-5) from the student performance and attendance and/or dropout data and indicate the supporting data sources:

STRENGTHS	DATA SOURCE
1. Attendance and Dropouts	Attendance Index and Dropout Index
2.	
3.	
4.	
5.	

Rank-order the identified areas of weakness (3-5) from the student performance and attendance and/or dropout data and indicate the supporting data sources:

WEAKNESSES	DATA SOURCE
1. 8 th Grade Mathematics and Science	CRT Trend Data
2. 6 th and 7 th Grade Reading	NRT Trend Data
3.	
4.	
5.	

List the underlying causes from the attitudinal/perceptual, behavioral, and archival data of the previously identified strengths:

UNDERLYING CAUSES OF THE STRENGTHS	DATA SOURCE
1. Faculty collaboration and teaming	DAT report and trend analysis
2. Active faculty involvement in School Improvement process	DAT report and trend analysis
3. Instructional staff implements variety of teaching strategies	DAT report and trend analysis

List the underlying causes from the attitudinal/perceptual, behavioral, and archival data of the previously identified weaknesses:

UNDERLYING CAUSES OF THE WEAKNESSES	DATA SOURCE
1. Parental and community involvement with school related activities is limited	DAT report and trend analysis
2. Instructional strategies geared toward higher order thinking, individual differences, and sustained writing utilized in a limited capacity	DAT report and trend analysis
3. Discipline problems compounded by the number of over-age students	DAT report and trend analysis

The identified weaknesses will lead to the goals. The underlying causes of the weaknesses will lead to the strategies.

STRATEGY PLANNING WORKSHEET

GOAL 1: (Derived from the prioritized weaknesses) To improve student achievement in mathematics.	New Baseline SPS 2002-03 & 2003-04 59.5	New SPS Goal 65.1	New Growth Target 5.6
OBJECTIVE 1: To increase the 6 th grade NRT Math Index from 46.8 to 54.1 by Spring 2005. OBJECTIVE 2: To increase the 7 th grade NRT Math Index from 60.7 to 66.6 by Spring 2005. OBJECTIVE 3: To increase the 8 th grade CRT Math Index from 40 to 46 by Spring 2005.	SCIENTIFICALLY BASED RESEARCH STRATEGY: Higher Order Thinking Differentiated Learning Integration of Technology Derived from the underlying causes: Lack of technology integration Lack of the use of probing questioning techniques Lack of variety of teaching strategies used		
NSDC Standard for Staff Development: (Identify which standards(s) will be addressed.) 1. Context: Professional Learning Communities 2. Process: Data-driven, constant review and analysis, research based strategies 3. Content: Family Involvement			

Expected Impact (Observable Change)	Activities	Persons Responsible	Target Audience and Timeline	1 Funding Sources 2 Object Code 3 Cost			Procedures for Evaluating Implementation and Effectiveness of Each Activity
				1	2	3	
1. Teachers differentiate learning of comprehensive curriculum to meet individual needs of all students utilizing scientifically research-based instructional strategies and meaningful resources. All students meet/exceed grade level	1a. *Initial Professional Development: -Selected teachers (Instructional Management Team (IMT) from the school will receive initial training on specific protocols to redeliver professional learning to whole faculty. -Train all teachers using the train-the trainer model on the Louisiana Comprehensive Curriculum (LACC) and Assessment.	District curriculum and accountability directors School Level Administrators & Instructional Management Team (IMT)	All teachers Summer 2005 Mid-Summer 2005	No Cost Title I	No Cost 600	No Cost Binders	Trained IMT teachers will complete session evaluations. IMT will align district level pacing guides and comprehensive curriculum. All trained teachers will complete session evaluations. Teachers will design school level implementation schedules based upon district level pacing guides. IMT will maintain logs, presentation sign in

expectations as a result of scientifically research-based teaching and learning of content as presented in the Louisiana Comprehensive Curriculum model evidenced by mastery of unit assessments.							sheets and training activity packets on file as well as copies of implementation schedules.
Teachers and administrators will become knowledgeable and effective in using strategies for collaborative planning through Professional Learning Communities.	<u>Initial Professional Development:</u> The IMT (or selected teachers) will participate in the Louisiana Staff Development Council Fall Conference focusing on Professional Learning Communities.	School Level Administrators & selected teachers	November 16-17, 2005	Title I	100 200 500	\$240.00 + benefits \$1,000.00 (registration)	Attendees will complete conference evaluations and develop plans for sharing PLC strategies at the school-level.
	<u>1b. Collaboration:</u> Collaborative sessions using student assessment through Edusoft (IMT, and/or grade level or department level) to meet and individual needs of all students.	School Level Administrators & Instructional Management Team Grade Level & Content Area Leaders	All teachers Monthly	No Cost	No Cost	No Cost	IMT as well as grade level and content area chairpersons will maintain meeting minutes and reports to be submitted to principals.
	<u>1c. Implementation:</u> Teachers will implement the curriculum in their classroom instruction according to the	School Level Administration	All teachers August, 2005 through May, 2006	Title I	400 600	\$8,600.00 \$26,584.58	Administrators will review lesson plans with teachers and conduct classroom observations. Teachers will examine

	recommended pacing guides, assessment through Edusoft, and using researched-based strategies.		Daily				student work and assess unit test results to inform instruction.
	<u>1d. Follow Up / Support:</u> School level administrators and support staff will model lessons, conduct classroom observations, and coach peers with the appropriate pre- and post-observation conferences.	School Level Administrators	All teachers and admin. August, 2005 through May, 2006 Monthly	No Cost	No Cost	No Cost	District monitors, administrators, and IMT will conduct observations to assess the effective implementation of the LACC as well as the appropriate use of strategies in classroom instruction. Observation forms and checklists provided.
	<u>1e. Parental Involvement:</u> Core Curriculum and Edusoft Information will be included at Parent Orientation		Parents August , 2005	Title I – PI	500		Sign in Sheets
2. Teachers knowledgeable and effective in the use of technology to evoke higher order thinking skills and activity based learning. -Teachers apply inquiry-based instructional methods using questioning strategies that are integrated across the curriculum	<u>2a. Professional Development:</u> All teachers will be trained on integration of problem solving inclusive of higher order thinking and integration of technology across the curriculum. All teachers will be trained on explicit teaching of learning strategies -Constructive responses -Graphic organizers -Strategies for comprehension	Technology Teacher (s)	Aug 05-May06 Grade 6 th , 7 th , 8 th	Title I	100 200	\$36,238.00 +benefits +subs (\$600.00)	Presentations by teachers at staff meetings, Lesson Plans, Observations
		All Instructional Personnel		Title I	100 200	\$1260.00 (subs)	

	<p><u>2b. Collaboration:</u> Teachers will participate in collaborative planning sessions to discuss the implementation and integration of higher order thinking activities and the integration of technology.</p> <p>Teachers will participate in a book study "<i>Whatever it takes</i>".</p> <p>Review book study chapters for continuous learning, "<i>Fulfilling the Promise of the Differentiated Classroom</i>" and "<i>Classroom Instruction that Works</i>".</p>	Department Chairpersons	All Teachers August, 2005- May, 2006	Title I	600	\$1750.00	Teachers will reflect and discuss lessons and techniques used to accommodate all learning styles of students. Peer observations will be graded using a rubric that addresses techniques that are a component of the differentiated classroom.
Students actively engaged in content lessons utilizing state standards focusing on higher order thinking and activity based learning through utilization of technology.	<p><u>2c. Implementation:</u> Teachers will utilize technology in classrooms lessons as appropriate.</p>	All Faculty	All Students	No Cost	No Cost	No Cost	Lesson Plans Student Work
	<p><u>2d. **Follow-up/Support:</u> Ongoing staff development training and support will be given to teachers throughout the year.</p>	All Instructional Personnel	Aug 05- May06 Grade 6 th , 7 th , 8 th	No Cost	No Cost	No Cost	Classroom observations with feedback
3. Parents will	<u>3a. Parental</u>	All Personnel	Aug 05-	Title I	600	\$500.00	Sign-In Sheets, Data

be informed of events and relevant information regarding the academic success/progress of their children	Involvement: Technology training, Web Site, Newsletters, NTI System, Teacher contact		May06 Grade 6 th ,7 th , 8th				Collection from NTI System, Log of Teacher Contact Copies of newsletter on file in main office
--	--	--	--	--	--	--	---

	Total Cost	Enter Total \$ Amount
Procedures for Evaluating the Goal, Objective(s) and Strategy: Compare LEAP 21 scores from Spring 2002 to Spring 2005 to look for growth in student achievement. Compare ITBS composite standard scores from Spring 2002 to Spring 2005 for growth in student achievement.		

- * Indicates Professional Development Learning
- ** Indicates Family Involvement Activities
- *** Indicates Safe and Drug-Free Activities (if applicable)

Note: Activities indicated should address all children including subgroups.

STRATEGY PLANNING WORKSHEET

GOAL 2: (Derived from the prioritized weaknesses) To improve student achievement in English Language Arts.	New Baseline SPS 2002-03 & 2003-04 59.5	New SPS Goal 65.1	New Growth Target 5.6
OBJECTIVE 1: To increase the 6 th grade NRT Reading Index from 37.6 to 45.8 by Spring 2005; Language Index from 58.5 to 64.7 by Spring 2005. OBJECTIVE 2: To increase the 7 th grade NRT Reading Index from 52.9 to 59.6 by Spring 2005; Language Index from 62.9 to 68.6 by Spring 2005. OBJECTIVE 3: To increase the 8 th grade CRT ELA Index from 44.8 to 50.32 by Spring 2005.	SCIENTIFICALLY BASED RESEARCH STRATEGY: Higher Order Thinking Differentiated Learning Integration of Technology Derived from the underlying causes: Lack of technology integration Lack of the use of probing questioning techniques Lack of variety of teaching strategies used		
NSDC Standard for Staff Development: (Identify which standards(s) will be addressed.) 1. Context: Professional Learning Communities 2. Process: Data-driven, constant review and analysis, research based strategies 3. Content: Family Involvement			

Expected Impact (Observable Change)	Activities	Persons Responsible	Target Audience and Timeline	1 Funding Sources 2 Object Code 3 Cost			Procedures for Evaluating Implementation and Effectiveness of Each Activity
				1	2	3	
1. Teachers differentiate learning of comprehensive curriculum to meet individual needs of all students utilizing scientifically research-based instructional strategies and meaningful resources. All students meet/exceed grade level expectations as a	1a. *Initial Professional Development: -Selected teachers (Instructional Management Team (IMT) from the school will receive initial training on specific protocols to redeliver professional learning to whole faculty. -Train all teachers using the train-the trainer model on the Louisiana Comprehensive Curriculum (LACC) and Assessment.	District curriculum and accountability directors School Level Administrators & Instructional Management Team (IMT)	All teachers Summer 2005 Mid-Summer 2005	No Cost	No Cost	No Cost	Trained IMT teachers will complete session evaluations. IMT will align district level pacing guides and comprehensive curriculum. All trained teachers will complete session evaluations. Teachers will design school level implementation schedules based upon district level pacing guides. IMT will maintain logs, presentation sign in sheets and training

result of scientifically research-based teaching and learning of content as presented in the Louisiana Comprehensive Curriculum model evidenced by mastery of unit assessments.							activity packets on file as well as copies of implementation schedules.
Teachers and administrators will become knowledgeable and effective in using strategies for collaborative planning through Professional Learning Communities.	<u>Initial Professional Development:</u> The IMT (or selected teachers) will participate in the Louisiana Staff Development Council Fall Conference focusing on Professional Learning Communities.	School Level Administrators & selected teachers	November 16-17, 2005	Title I	100 200 500	\$240.00 + benefits \$1000.00 (registration) Duplicate Amount	Attendees will complete conference evaluations and develop plans for sharing PLC strategies at the school-level.
	<u>1b. Collaboration:</u> Collaborative sessions using student assessment through Edusoft (IMT, and/or grade level or department level) to meet and individual needs of all students.	School Level Administrators & Instructional Management Team Grade Level & Content Area Leaders	All teachers Monthly	No Cost	No Cost	No Cost	IMT as well as grade level and content area chairpersons will maintain meeting minutes and reports to be submitted to principals.
	<u>1c. Implementation:</u> Teachers will implement the curriculum in their classroom instruction according to the recommended pacing guides, assessment	School Level Administration	All teachers August, 2005 through May, 2006 Daily	Title I	400 600	\$8,600.00 \$26,584.58 Duplicate Amount	Administrators will review lesson plans with teachers and conduct classroom observations. Teachers will examine student work and assess unit test results to inform

	through Edusoft, and using researched-based strategies.						instruction.
	1d. Follow Up / Support: School level administrators and support staff will model lessons, conduct classroom observations, and coach peers with the appropriate pre- and post-observation conferences.	School Level Administrators	All teachers and administrators August, 2005 through May, 2006 Monthly	No Cost	No Cost	No Cost	District monitors, administrators, and IMT will conduct observations to assess the effective implementation of the LACC as well as the appropriate use of strategies in classroom instruction. Observation forms and checklists provided.
	1e. Parental Involvement: Core Curriculum Information will be included at Parent Orientation		Parents August , 2005	Title I – PI	500		Agenda Sign in Sheets
2. Teachers knowledgeable and effective in the use of technology to evoke higher order thinking skills and activity based learning. -Teachers apply inquiry-based instructional methods using questioning strategies that are integrated across the curriculum	2a. Professional Development: All teachers will be trained on integration of problem solving inclusive of higher order thinking and integration of technology across the curriculum. All teachers will be trained on explicit teaching of learning strategies -Constructive responses -Graphic organizers -Strategies for comprehension	Technology Teacher (s) All Instructional Personnel	Aug 05- May06 Grade 6 th ,7 th , 8 th	Title I Title I	100 200 100 200	\$36,238.00 +benefits +subs (\$600.00) \$1260.00 (subs) Duplicate Amount	Presentations by teachers at staff meetings, Lesson Plans, Observations
	2b. Collaboration:	Department	All Teachers	Title I	600	\$1750.00	Teachers will reflect and

	<p>Teachers will participate in collaborative planning sessions to discuss the implementation and integration of higher order thinking activities and the integration of technology.</p> <p>Teachers will participate in a book study "<i>Whatever it takes</i>".</p> <p>Review book study chapters for continuous learning, "<i>Fulfilling the Promise of the Differentiated Classroom</i>" and "<i>Classroom Instruction that Works</i>".</p>	Chairpersons	August, 2005-May, 2006			Duplicate Amount	discuss lessons and techniques used to accommodate all learning styles of students. Peer observations will be graded using a rubric that addresses techniques that are a component of the differentiated classroom.
Students actively engaged in content lessons utilizing state standards focusing on higher order thinking and activity based learning through utilization of technology.	2c. Implementation: Teachers will utilize technology in classrooms lessons as appropriate.	All Faculty	All Students	No Cost	No Cost	No Cost	Lesson Plans Student Work
	2d. Follow-up/Support: Ongoing staff development training and support will be given to teachers throughout the year.	All Instructional Personnel	Aug 05-May06 Grade 6 th , 7 th , 8 th	No Cost	No Cost	No Cost	Classroom observations with feedback
3. Teacher	3a. Professional	Administration	All	No	No	No	Lesson Plans

model and teach the writing process across the curriculum.	Development: All teachers will participate in at training focusing on: -integrating the writing process -5 step writing process -4 types of writing(Expository, Persuasive, Descriptive, Narrative)		instructional Staff August 2005	Cost	Cost	Cost	Observations Research Based Units
	3b. Collaboration: Teachers will participate in collaborative planning sessions to discuss the implementation of writing across the curriculum.	Department Chairperson	All instructional Staff August 2005- May, 2006	No Cost	No Cost	No Cost	Classroom observations with feedback
	3c. Implementation: Teachers will Integrate writing process across the curriculum, teach the 5 steps to the writing process and the 4 types of writing	All Instructional Personnel	Aug05-May06 Grade 6 th ,7 th , 8th	No Cost	No Cost	No Cost	Lesson Plans, Observations, Research-Based Units
	3d. Follow-up/Support: Ongoing staff development training and support will be given to teachers throughout the year.	Administration	All instructional Staff August 2005	No Cost	No Cost	No Cost	Classroom observations with feedback
4.Parents will be informed of events and relevant information regarding the academic success/progress of their children.	4a. Parental Involvement: Technology training, Web Site, Newsletters, NTI System, Teacher contact	All Personnel	Aug 05- May06 Grade 6 th ,7 th , 8th	Title I	600	\$500.00	Sign-In Sheets, Data Collection from NTI System, Log of Teacher Contact

Total Cost	Enter Total \$ Amount	
<p>Procedures for Evaluating the Goal, Objective(s) and Strategy: Compare LEAP 21 scores from Spring 2002 to Spring 2005 to look for growth in student achievement. Compare ITBS composite standard scores from Spring 2002 to Spring 2005 for growth in student achievement.</p>		

- * Indicates Professional Development Learning
- ** Indicates Family Involvement Activities
- *** Indicates Safe and Drug-Free Activities (if applicable)

Note: Activities indicated should address all children including subgroups.

RESEARCH RATIONALE FOR STRATEGIES

Strategy: Higher order, real life, current events

Goal 1: Click to Enter Goal 1

Cotton, K. CLASSROOM QUESTIONING: CLOSE-UP NO. 5. Portland, OR: Northwest Regional Educational Laboratory, May 1888.

Bibliographic Notation: Haller, E.P.; Child, D.A.; and Walberg, H. J. "Can Comprehension Be Taught? A Quantitative Synthesis of 'Metacognitive' Studies." EDUCATIONAL RESEARCHER 17/9 (1988): 5-8.

Brief Summary of Research:

Thinking skills instruction enhances academic achievement. A broad, general finding from the research base is that nearly all of the thinking skills programs and practices investigated were found to make a positive difference in the achievement levels of participating students. Studies which looked at achievement over time found that thinking skills instruction accelerated the learning gains of participants, and those with true or quasi-experimental designs generally found that experimental students outperformed controls to a significant degree. Reports with such finding include: Barba and merchant 1990; Bass and Perkins 1984; Bransford, et al. 1986; Crump, Schlichter, and Palk 1988; Freseman 1990; Haller, Child, and Walberg 1988; Hansler 1985; Horton and Ryba 1986; Hudhins and Edelman 1986; Kagan 1988; Marshall 1987; Matthews 1989; MCREL 1985; Nicherson 1984; Pearson 1982; Pogrow 1988; Ristow 1988; Ridign and Powell 1985, 1987; Robinson 1987; Sadowski 1984-85; Snapp and Glover 1990; Sternberg and Bhana 1986; Tenenbaum 1986; Whimbey 1985; Wong 1985; and Worsham and Austin 1983.

Rationale: Describe how this strategy, in relation to the research, addresses the needs of the student population in your school. Was the research conducted in similar school with similar populations and needs?

Click to Enter Rationale; Allow Word Wrapping

If this strategy addresses the needs of any of the subgroups, indicate which subgroup and describe how it will serve their needs:

Click to Enter Subgroup Information; Allow Word Wrapping

RESEARCH RATIONALE FOR STRATEGIES

Strategy: Technology Integration

Goal 1: Click to Enter Goal 1

Losak, J.L., & MacFarland, T. 1994. "An evaluation of Florida's model technology schools program 1988 ti 19993: You can't go home again" Report 94-02. Fort Lauderdale, FL: Nova University.

Bibliographic Notation:

Bialo, E. & Sivin, J. 1990. Report on the effectiveness of microcomputer in schools. Washington, DC: software Publishers Association.

Brief Summary of Research:

Effective use of technology to promote high levels of learning for all students requires integrating technology into a standard-based instructional program and providing teachers with abundant professional development related to its instructional uses

Rationale: Describe how this strategy, in relation to the research, addresses the needs of the student population in your school. Was the research conducted in similar school with similar populations and needs?

Click to Enter Rationale; Allow Word Wrapping

If this strategy addresses the needs of any of the subgroups, indicate which subgroup and describe how it will serve their needs:

Click to Enter Subgroup Information; Allow Word Wrapping

RESEARCH RATIONALE FOR STRATEGIES

Strategy: Click to Enter Strategy

Goal 1: Click to Enter Goal 1

Bibliographic Notation: Click to Enter Notation; Allow Word Wrapping

Brief Summary of Research: Click to Enter Summary; Allow Word Wrapping

Rationale: Describe how this strategy, in relation to the research, addresses the needs of the student population in your school. Was the research conducted in similar school with similar populations and needs?

Click to Enter Rationale; Allow Word Wrapping

If this strategy addresses the needs of any of the subgroups, indicate which subgroup and describe how it will serve their needs:

Click to Enter Subgroup Information; Allow Word Wrapping

RESEARCH RATIONALE FOR STRATEGIES

Strategy: Click to Enter Strategy

Goal 1: Click to Enter Goal 1

Bibliographic Notation: Click to Enter Notation; Allow Word Wrapping

Brief Summary of Research: Click to Enter Summary; Allow Word Wrapping

Rationale: Describe how this strategy, in relation to the research, addresses the needs of the student population in your school. Was the research conducted in similar school with similar populations and needs?

Click to Enter Rationale; Allow Word Wrapping

If this strategy addresses the needs of any of the subgroups, indicate which subgroup and describe how it will serve their needs:

Click to Enter Subgroup Information; Allow Word Wrapping

Duplicate (copy and paste table) as needed.

TOTAL SCHOOL BUDGET FOR RESTRICTED AND DISCRETIONARY FUNDS

Indicate the total funds per Funding Source, per object category. See *SAM 2000* for clarity on operational definitions.

FUNDING SOURCES*	TITLE I	TITLE I, P.I.							TOTAL
------------------	---------	---------------	--	--	--	--	--	--	-------

SALARIES (100)	\$40,838.00								
EMPLOYEE BENEFITS (200)	\$13,073.42								
PURCHASED PROFESSIONAL and TECHNICAL SERVICES (300)									
PURCHASED PROPERTY SERVICES (400)	\$8,600.00								
OTHER PURCHASES SERVICES (500)	\$3,600.00								
SUPPLIES (600)	\$28,334.58								
INDIRECT COSTS (if applicable)									
PROPERTY (700)									
OTHER OBJECTS (800)									
OTHER USES OF FUNDS (900)									
TOTAL	\$94,446.00								

*Funding Sources: Title I – Part A, Part B (Even Start), Part C (Migrant), Part D (N & D), Part F (CSRP); Title II – Part A (Professional Development), Part D (Technology); Title III – English Language Proficient; Title V – Parental Choice and Innovative Programs; Title VII – Part A (Indian Education), Part B (Native Hawaiian Education), Part C (Alaska Native Education); Learn and Serve America; McKinney-Vento Homeless Assistance Act; State Funding; 8(g); LaSIP; Foreign Languages; IDEA; K-3 Initiatives; Early Reading First; MSL; Education Excellence Act; School Choice; miscellaneous funding sources; foundations/grants, etc.

BUDGET WORKSHEET BY ACHIEVEMENT GOAL AND FUNDING SOURCE

FUNDING SOURCES*	PROFESSIONAL DEVELOPMENT				FAMILY INVOLVEMENT				OTHER			
	Goal 1	Goal 2	Goal 3	Total	Goal 1	Goal 2	Goal 3	Total	Goal 1	Goal 2	Goal 3	Total
TITLE I												
TITLE II												
Etc.												
TOTALS												

*Funding Sources: Title I – Part A, Part B (Even Start), Part C (Migrant), Part D (N & D), Part F (CSRP); Title II – Part A (Professional Development), Part D (Technology); Title III – English Language Proficient; Title V – Parental Choice and Innovative Programs; Title VII – Part A (Indian Education), Part B (Native Hawaiian Education), Part C (Alaska Native Education); Learn and Serve America; McKinney-Vento Homeless Assistance Act; State Funding; 8(g); LaSIP; Foreign Languages; IDEA; K-3 Initiatives; Early Reading First; MSL; Education Excellence Act; School Choice; miscellaneous funding sources; foundations/grants, etc.

TOTAL EXPENDITURE PER ACHIEVEMENT GOAL		TOTAL EXPENDITURE PER FUNDING SOURCE	
GOAL 1		FUNDING SOURCE 1	
GOAL 2		FUNDING SOURCE 2	
GOAL 3		FUNDING SOURCE 3	
ETC.		ETC.	

DATA ATTACHMENTS

The following items should be included in the data attachments:

- School Accountability Report Cards (Parent and Principal)
- Summary of Findings of Survey Data (Teachers, Parents, Students, and Principal)
- Summary of Findings of Interview Data (Principal, Counselor, Students, Teachers) (Not Optional for Schools in School Improvement/CSRP)
- Summary of Findings of Focus Group Data (Teachers, Students, Parents) (Not Optional for Schools in School Improvement/CSRP)
- Data Triangulation Form or SAM 2000 Vote-Counting Method: Strength/Weakness Summary Sheet
- Comprehensive Needs Assessment: Final Report
- Data Notebook (for schools participating in School Analysis Model-SAM 2000)
- Special Education Monitoring Report (district level)
- Other Pertinent Data (other IOWA summary data, ACT summaries, PSAT summaries, etc.)