

WayPoint School Improvement Plan - Fall 2009 to Fall 2010

Introductory Statement

On a continual basis, schools must analyze and evaluate their policies and practices to ensure for the very best in student achievement. In today's world of rapid change, such analysis and evaluation must be on-going and cannot wait to be reviewed every 3 to 5 years. School improvement efforts,, with their focus on *enhanced student performance and achievement* requires that we constantly monitor our policies and practices...day to day, week to week, month to month and year to year. Anything short of that only increases the chance that students may fall behind in their academic and social achievement, failing to succeed to their fullest potential. For that reason, this School Improvement Plan has been prepared for one year...and will be revised on an annual basis as we monitor our students' achievement success regularly throughout the year.

Research clearly demonstrates that there are defined school level factors and teacher level factors that, when in place, monitored and evaluated, lead to enhanced student achievement: according to Robert Marzano of McREL, those school level factors are: *a guaranteed & viable curriculum; challenging goals & effective feedback; parent & community involvement; safe & orderly environment; and collegiality & professionalism*. Teacher-level factors include: *effective instructional strategies; effective classroom management; and effective classroom curriculum design*. We dedicate ourselves to delivering on those school-level and teacher-level factors delineated by Dr. Marzano and his research team.

Further research on high achieving schools, specifically in the 90/90/90 research study as conducted by Dr. Douglas Reeves and his team at the Leadership and Learning Institute in Colorado, there are clearly outlined characteristics reflective of and practices when implemented on a consistent basis, which lead to high student achievement...highly effective teaching and learning. We embark this year on comprehensive analysis, planning and implementation of those characteristics and practices.

WayPoint (formerly MTA) recently completed its eighth year as a Public School Academy; in that time, the Academy has realized a great deal of success: we've established a school climate that is safe and orderly and learning focused. We have created, and are continue to build, a process for collaborative inquiry which is data driven; and we challenge ourselves to provide and promote a school based on inclusive and equitable educational policies and practices. We work to effectively communicate with our constituents: students, parents, staff, community/media, business & industry, and other educational institutions. We realize that operational resource management is vital if we are to remain viable, and regularly monitor ourselves as we work to comply with all Federal, State and Charter school mandates; as we work to create and maintain a fund balance which allows for strong and stable finances; as we monitor our use of time and space, and as we work to provide the necessary equipment and materials needed for use by our staff and students. In our first 8 years, we've grown from a student population of 112 to one of 220, growing from grades 6-9 to grades 6-12. After our initial building was built in 2000 and opened for the 2001-2002 school year, we've expanded our

facility twice, at the end of the 2002-2003 school year and again at the end of the 2005-2006 school year, adhering to our promise to provide small class sizes for students and allowing for increased services and programs for students.

We have learned a great deal from our first 8 years, and, as we begin our second year, as WayPoint Academy, we are focused on solid improvement throughout the Academy, *all focused on increased and enhanced student achievement*. This Plan serves as our “blueprint of improvement” as we enthusiastically embrace our future. *Our students are worth WHATEVER it takes...* as we prepare them for “life after high school”!

Goal Area: *Student Achievement in Reading Proficiency*

Need Statement: Reading proficiency is essential to success in every area of the curricula. The Academy curricula, aligned with the MI Curriculum Framework and the MI Merit Curriculum, requires students to read at grade level or fall behind in their preparation & preparedness for passing the HS graduation requirements. Analysis of MEAP and MME Reading assessment results over the past 3 years demonstrates gains being made, however, they continue to lag behind the State average, though above our constituent “like” district for our Title I subgroup. Analysis of both MEAP and NWEA “Measures of Academic Progress” assessments, and local assessments, indicates high needs in areas of Comprehension, and Informational Text. Number of students attaining their NWEA M.A.P. Reading Target Growth goals, Fall to Spring 2008-2009, targeted for improvement last year, increased substantially; continued emphasis & focus still needed.

Goal Summary: By June, 2010, the number of students meeting proficiency standards on the MEAP Reading assessment, grades 6-8, will increase by no less than 15%.

Goal Summary: By June, 2010, the achievement gap between economically disadvantaged and non economically disadvantaged students will narrow to 1% or less in reading proficiency as assessed by the MEAP.

Goal Summary: By June, 2010, 100% of economically disadvantaged students will attain their Target Growth Goal in Reading as assessed by the NWEA “Measure of Academic Progress”.

Action Strategies (Tasks)	Person Responsible for Implementing Strategy	Resources Needed to Complete Task	Budget Implications	Dates of Activity	Monitoring Dates	Monitoring Indicators
<p><u>Instruction:</u></p> <p>1.1 Review MEAP, MME, MAP & PLAN Reading item analysis for “high needs” content, skills, practices; incorporate into instruction</p> <p>1.2 Review MEAP & MAP item analysis for “high needs” content, skills, practices; incorporate into focused instruction, especially during SSR periods</p> <p>1.3 Implement “Read Naturally” program for Basic level achievers who struggle to “decode” words</p>	<p>MS Team led by Trisha as literacy coach</p> <p>HS Staff led by Cathy as literacy coach</p> <p>Amy Gongalski & Develyn Howard</p>	<p>MEAP & MAP test item analysis report</p> <p>MME, MAP & PLAN test item analysis report</p> <p>Read Naturally & Read 180 program modules</p>	<p>\$3.5K</p> <p>\$3.5K</p> <p>\$2.5K</p>	<p>Summer/Fall 2009</p> <p>Summer/Fall 2009</p> <p>2009-2010</p>	<p>On going</p> <p>On going</p> <p>On going</p>	<p>Lesson plans indicate incorporation of targeted “high needs” knowledge, skills, practices</p> <p>Module assessments</p>

Action Strategies (Tasks)	Person Responsible for Implementing Strategy	Resources Needed to Complete Task	Budget Implications	Dates of Activity	Monitoring Dates	Monitoring Indicators
<p><u>Instruction:</u></p> <p>1.1 Identify academic & content vocabulary words challenging for students</p>	<p>Teaching staff led by Trisha & Cathy</p>	<p>Curriculum and content area texts</p>	<p>None</p>	<p>2009-2010</p>	<p>Monthly</p>	<p>List of vocabulary for instruction; use in non-fiction writing & assessments</p>

1.2 Integrate academic & content vocabulary words into daily instruction, including Daily Announcements & message board	Trisha, Cathy, Barbara & staff	List of targeted vocabulary words	None	2009-2010	Weekly	List of vocabulary words; to change on a rotating basis
1.3 Review MAP RIT Range vocabulary for integration into classroom instruction 1.4 Develop RIT Range Vocabulary lists for classroom instruction 1.5 Disaggregate MAP Reading RIT Ranges for each student to focus classroom instruction 1.6 Continue to incorporate “Thinking Maps” into content area instruction	Trisha, Barbara & staff	MAP RIT Range vocabulary words “Thinking Maps” materials & continued PD	None None	2009-2010	Weekly	List of vocabulary words developed for each RIT Range Individualized achievement plan for students

Action Strategies (Tasks)	Person Responsible for Implementing Strategy	Resources Needed to Complete Task	Budget Implications	Dates of Activity	Monitoring Dates	Monitoring Indicators
1.6 Continue to “grow” an Instructional Resources Library for use by staff	Barbara	Storage	\$1k to 3K	On-going	Monthly	Resource library
1.7 Continued implementation of Effective Reading & Writing Instructional Strategies	Trisha, Cathy, Barbara focused on works by Dr. Angela Perry; Carl Anderson; Lucy Calkins	PD funds and days	Title IIA monies	2009-2010	Weekly	Common writing assessments scores based on common writing rubric; MEAP, MAP, PLAN and MME assessments

1.8 Continued Academy-wide integration of the 6+1 Writing Traits program	Teaching staff led by Trisha and Cathy	6+1 materials	None	2009-2010	Weekly	Increased MEAP, MAP, PLAN, MME reading & writing scores
--	--	---------------	------	-----------	--------	---

Action Strategies (Tasks)	Person Responsible for Implementing Strategy	Resources Needed to Complete Task	Budget Implications	Dates of Activity	Monitoring Dates	Monitoring Indicators
Assessment: 1.1 Analyze MAP results to highlight instructional needs; create student RIT target goals & plan for instruction	Cathy & Trisha to provide PD to staff Teachers to create instructional plans for target RIT goals	MAP Reports	None	2009 - 2010	Monthly	Staff understanding & use of MAP assessment results in classroom instruction & individual student program planning
1.2 Continue to incorporate & further develop quarterly common assessments for all grade levels	Trisha & staff	Assessment guides, computers, paper	Minimal	Fall 2009 work to complete by Spring 2010	Quarterly	Common assessment documents used by teachers
1.3 Continue to incorporate use of a common writing rubric at MS & HS levels	Cathy & Trisha	MAISD ELA consultant	None	Fall & Winter 2009-2010	Weekly	Assessment of student writing by MS & HS teacher team

Goal Area: *Student Achievement in Writing Proficiency*

Need Statement: Writing proficiency is essential to success in every area of the curriculum. The Academy curricula, aligned with the MI Curriculum Framework and the MI Merit Curriculum, requires students to express themselves coherently, especially in the area of written expression. Failure to write proficiently results in poor academic achievement across the content areas reducing the likelihood that students will successfully reach the MI HS graduation requirements. Analysis of MEAP & MME Writing assessment results over the past 3 years demonstrates increased proficiency achievement, however, results continue to lag behind the State average, though beyond constituent “like” district for our Title 1 subgroup. We note a lack of significant and sustained achievement at the 8th grade level, resulting in poor achievement in high school level English. Analysis of MEAP, MME and NWEA “Measure of Academic Progress”, and local assessments, indicate high need in Writing Process and Writing Genres.

Goal Summary: By June, 2010, the number of students who achieve proficiency standards on the MEAP Writing Assessment in grades 6-8 will increase by at least 25%.

Goal Summary: By June, 2010, the achievement gap between economically disadvantaged and non economically disadvantaged students will narrow to 5% or less in grades 6-8 as assessed by the MEAP Writing assessment.

Action Strategies (Tasks)	Person Responsible for Implementing Strategy	Resources Needed To Complete Task	Budget Implications	Dates of Activity	Monitoring Dates	Monitoring Indicators
<u>Curriculum:</u>			None			
1.1 GLCE review to ensure alignment to curriculum 1.2 Align new HS ELA CE “units” to ensure for curriculum alignment	Trisha & MS staff Cathy & HS staff	GLCE Standards & Benchmarks HS ELA CEs	None	2009- 2010	Monthly	Documented alignment of curriculum with GLCE & HS ELA CE standards & units
1.3 Continue alignment of ELA curriculum grades 6 through 12	Trisha, Cathy and staff	Meeting time; GLCE & HSCEs; curriculum maps	None	2009-2010	Monthly	Instructional delivery follows developed curriculum maps for each course grades 5-12;

						unit & lesson plans monitored
1.4 Review MEAP & MME writing item analysis for “high needs” content, skills, practices, to incorporate into instruction	MS Staff led by Trisha & Cathy	MEAP test item analysis report; MME/ACT item analysis report; PLAN item analysis report	None	2009-2010	On going	Lesson plans indicate incorporation of targeted “high needs” knowledge, skills, practices
1.5 Align SE ELA course content & expectations to the GLCEs & HS ELA CEs; team SE content area teachers with GE counterparts	Trisha, Amy & Develyn & Cathy	GLCE Standards & Benchmarks; HS ELA CEs;	None	Fall 2009	On going	Developed curriculum maps in all SE classes aligned with GLCEs & HS ELA CEs; instructional delivery follows maps
1.6 Continued Academy-wide integration of the 6+1 Writing Traits program	Teaching staff led by Trisha and Cathy	6+1 materials	None	2009-2010	Weekly	Increased MEAP & MME reading & writing scores
Instruction: 1.1 Identify academic & content vocabulary words challenging for students	Teaching staff led by Trisha & Cathy	Curriculum and content area texts	None	2009-2010	Monthly	List of vocabulary for instruction
1.2 Disaggregate MAP Language Usage RIT Ranges for each student; focus classroom instruction accordingly	Trisha & Barbara & Cathy w/ MS & HS teachers	MAP RIT Range reports for Language usage	None	2009-2010	Monthly	Individualized achievement plan for students
1.3 Continued implementation of Effective Reading & Writing Instructional Strategies	Barbara & staff (with ELA consultant from MAISD)	PD funds and days	Title IIA monies	2009-2010	Monthly	Increased MEAP & MME & MAP & PLAN writing scores
1.4 Continued Academy-wide integration of the 6+1 Writing Traits program across all content areas and classroom instruction 1.5 “Thinking Maps” integration into content area instruction	Teaching staff led by Trisha & Cathy Staff led by Barbara	6+1 materials “Thinking Maps” PD & materials	None Title IIA monies	2009-2010 2009-2010	Weekly Weekly	Increased MEAP reading & writing scores; increased Language usage Growth Goal attainment Increased student proficiency with cause/effect, compare/contrast, inferential processing

Assessment:						
1.1 Analyze MAP results to highlight instructional needs	Cathy & Trisha to provide PD for staff	MAP Reports	None	Continue Fall 2009 to Spring 2010	Monthly	Staff understanding & use of MAP assessment results in classroom instruction & individual student program planning
1.2 Continue to develop & implement quarterly common assessments for all grade levels	Trisha, Cathy & staff	Assessment guides, computers, paper	Minimal	Continue Fall 2009 work to complete by Spring 2010	Weekly & monthly	Common assessment documents used by teachers
1.1 Review alignment of MAP results with MEAP success indicators	Barbara & Trisha	MI Tracker	Yearly MI Tracker fee		Monthly	Alignment use reports from MI Tracker
1.2 Assess SE students quarterly for growth	Amy, Develyn & Amie	MAP tool; computer lab	None	Sept. Jan & May 2009-2010	Quarterly	Increased academic growth

Goal Area: *Student Achievement in Mathematics Proficiency*

Need Statement: Our analysis of MEAP, MME, NWEA “Measures of Academic Progress” and local assessments clearly indicates low achievement and high needs in mathematics; though substantial progress has been made the past 3 years, most notably at the 6th & 7th grade levels, 8th grade performance remains stagnant, resulting in poor performance in Algebra 1 at 9th grade; math achievement continues to lag behind the State average. The increased mathematics achievement standards in the MI high school graduation requirements mandate that students perform at or above grade level in order to be successful. Our analysis of student achievement indicates that our Title 1 subgroup lags behind our other groups in math achievement demonstrating high needs in Numbers & Operations, Algebra, Measurement, Geometry and Data & Probability. Math achievement on the MEAP and MME continue to lag substantially behind the State average.

Goal Summary: By June, 2010, the number of students attaining proficiency in State mathematics standards as assessed by the MEAP will increase to no less than 75% in grades 7 & 8 and maintain high proficiency in grade 6.

Goal Summary: By June, 2010, the number of students attaining proficiency in State mathematics standards as assessed by the MME will increase by no less than 20%.

Goal Summary: By June, 2010, the achievement gap between economically disadvantaged and non economically disadvantaged students will decrease to 1% or less in grades 6-8 on the MEAP and in grade 11 on the MME.

Goal Summary: By June, 2010, the number of students attaining their Target Growth Goals on the NWEA “Measures of Academic Progress” will increase by at least 30%.

Goal Summary: By June, 2010, 100% of economically disadvantaged students will attain their mathematics Target Growth Goals as assessed by NWEA’s “Measures of Academic Progress”.

Action Strategies (Tasks)	Person Responsible for Implementing Strategy	Resources Needed To Complete Task	Budget Implications	Dates of Activity	Monitoring Dates	Monitoring Indicators
Curriculum: 1.1 GLCE review to ensure alignment to curriculum 1.2 HS Math CE review to ensure for curriculum alignment	Deanne & Cindy with math teachers	GLCE Standards & Benchmarks HS Math CEs	None	2009-2010	Monthly	Documented alignment of curriculum with GLCE & HS Math CE standards
1.3 Align Math curriculum grades 6 through 12	Deanne & Cindy with math teachers	Meeting time; MMC document; curriculum maps	None	2009-2010	Monthly	Instructional delivery follows developed curriculum maps for each course grades 6-12
1.4 Review MEAP Math test item analysis for “high needs” content, skills, practices; incorporate into instruction; review MME math test item analysis for “high needs” content, skills, practices, incorporating into instruction	Staff led by Deanne & Cindy	MEAP test item analysis report & MI Tracker	None	Spring & Summer 2009; Fall 2010	On going	Lesson plans indicate incorporation of targeted “high needs” knowledge, skills, practices; walkthroughs confirm delivery
1.5 Align SE Math course content & expectations to the GLCEs & HS Math CEs; team SE content area teachers with GE counterparts	Deanne, Develyn & Amy	GLCE Standards & Benchmarks; HS Math CEs;	None	Fall 2009	On going	Developed curriculum maps in all SE classes aligned with GLCEs & HS Math CEs

<p><u>Instruction:</u></p> <p>1.1 Identify mathematic academic & content vocabulary words challenging for students</p>	Teaching staff led by Cindy & Deanne	Curriculum and content area texts	None	2009-2010	Monthly	List of vocabulary for targeted instruction; incorporation into instruction as witnessed during walk throughs
1.2 Disaggregate MAP Math RIT Ranges for each student; focus classroom instruction accordingly	Cindy & Deanne with teachers	MAP RIT Range reports for mathematics	None	2009-2010	Monthly	Individualized achievement plan for students
<p>1.3 Participation in County wide RMAMg (Raising Math Achievement in the Middle Grades) improvement PD program</p> <p>1.4 Participate in County wide “Back on Track” Algebra</p>	MS math instructors	Subs for 4 PD days	Title II A PD funds	2009-2010	Monthly	Increased capacity in math instruction as evidenced in classroom observations; improved student achievement on Math MEAP scores
	HS math instructors	Subs for 8 PD days	Title II A PD funds	2009-2010	Monthly	
<p><u>Assessment:</u></p> <p>1.1 Analyze MAP results to highlight instructional needs</p>	Deanne & Cindy to provide PD for staff	MAP Reports	None	Fall 2009to Spring 2010	Monthly	Staff understanding & use of MAP assessment results in classroom instruction & individual student program planning
1.2 Review alignment of MAP results with MEAP success indicators	Deanne & Cindy	MI Tracker	Yearly MI Tracker fee	Fall & Winter 2009-2010	Monthly	Alignment use reports from MI Tracker
1.3 Assess SE students quarterly with the MAP assessment to monitor for growth as outlined on IEPs	Develyn & Amy	MAP assessment; computer lab	None	Sept; Jan; May each year	Quarterly	Increased achievement by SE students

Goal Area: *Student Achievement & Success in 9th Grade Core Classes will significantly increase*

Need Statement: A 3 year analysis of academic performance of 9th graders in English, Biology and Algebra demonstrate a significant failure rate. Such failure at the 9th grade level negatively impacts the Academy high school drop out rate as students become frustrated and impatient with their poor performance and progress. We note increasingly larger numbers of students entering the Academy at grades 8 and 9 significantly behind academically; significant interventive measures, focused on getting students’ academic performance to grade level, and working to help students see the relevance between what they learn in school and real life/work are critical as we focus to ensure that ALL students are successful and earn: 1) a HS diploma, 2) are focused and ready to pursue post secondary education opportunities, and 3) find success in the world of work. Significant interventions are required in grades 6-9 to ensure for such student academic success.

Goal Summary: The number of students earning an “N” in English 1, Biology 1, and/or Algebra 1 by June, 2010, will be reduced by at least 70%.

Goal Summary: The number of 8th grade students failing 2 or more core classes by the end of the 2009-2010 school year will decrease by no less than 50%.

Goal Summary: By June, 2010, at least 80% of the students enrolled in English 1, Biology 1, and Algebra 1 will be earning a 70% or better.

Action Strategies (Tasks)	Person Responsible for Implementing Strategy	Resources Needed to Complete Task	Budget Implications	Date of Activity (Start to End)	Monitoring Dates	Monitoring Indicators
1.1 Survey students to evaluate their satisfaction with the Academy yearly	Barbara	Zoomerang survey tool	None	Fall of each school year	n/a	Completed survey
1.2 Survey parents of students to evaluate their satisfaction with the Academy’s academic program	Amie	Survey document; postage; Zoomerang survey tool	Postage	Spring of each school year	On going	Survey data to analyze
1.3 Create a MS to HS Success Transition Program	Rob, Trisha, Amie	IGNITE training	Title II A funds	Implementation Summer of 2009	Weekly	Transition program; academic review

1.4 Create an Academy-wide rubric of the WayPoint Way conduct expectations to be taught to students for behavior self monitoring/assessment	Cathy & Trisha to lead MS & HS teams	None	None	Sept to May	Monthly	Rubric established & used by staff and students; continuous reduction in disciplinary referrals
1.5 Implement program of “credit recovery”	Barbara & Amie	EdOptions	\$4K	Summer 2009	Quarterly	Program implemented & students achieving credit recovery
1.6 Study and implementation of characteristics and practices of high achieving schools as outlined in Dr. Douglas Reeves’ 90/90/90 research study	Barbara & staff	MS & HS teams	\$6K	Fall 2009 – Fall 2010	Weekly	“Look fors” are recognized as “walk throughs” are conducted by Supt.; classroom teachers are implementing what is being learned during PD trainings

**Need
Statement:**
After reviewing the results of the Spring

