

# **Jonathan Jennings Elementary School #0825**



## **PL 221 PLAN**

**2016-2019 SCHOOL YEAR**

**Submitted: Fall, 2016**

# Table of Contents

<u>Title</u>	<u>Page</u>
Executive Summary (Description of school, purpose, achievements).....	3
Parental Participation	
Technology Plan	
Safe and Disciplined Learning Environment	
Attendance	
Description and Location of Curriculum.....	6
Title and descriptions of Assessment.....	8
Belief Statement, Mission, Vision.....	9
Leadership team.....	9
Three-Year Goals.....	10
Data Summary – Data Wise.....	11
Collection, Analysis and Reporting of Data (needs of improvement)	
ISTEP/Graduation rate/Benchmarks	
Action Plans and Professional Development –	
Goals/objectives/Implementation/Timeline	
Elementary Summary Sheet for Key ISTEP+ Data.....	17
Statuses to be Waived.....	22
Appendix.....	23
Comprehensive Needs Assessment.....	23
School Review.....	34
Highly Qualified (HOUSSE).....	35
Title I Schoolwide Plan Checklist.....	36
Assurance – Building/District.....	38

## Executive Summary (Overview)

### School and Community Description

Jonathan Jennings Elementary School is a Pre K-5 public education facility. Our preschool is on site which allows for a successful transition to kindergarten with

transition programs such as Camp Kindergarten. Jonathan Jennings Elementary is one of 12 elementary schools under the jurisdiction of the Greater Clark County School Corporation. The corporation has three middle schools and three high schools strategically located to serve a geographically and ethnically diverse community. The Greater Clark County Schools is situated in southeastern tip of Indiana; its southern border is the Ohio River and across the river is Louisville, Kentucky. The community is an area of mixed income with 55% of the students receiving free or reduced lunch. The Charlestown community is comprised of mostly single family dwellings.

### Achievements and Areas of Improvements

Beginning in 2009-present time, Jonathan Jennings Elementary School began the use of Goal Clarity lesson planning. This is a standards based collaborative system that focuses on standards, vocabulary, Depth of Knowledge, and assessment. Teachers utilized the state curriculum maps that were placed on-line through the IDOE's Learning Connection site in all planning. In accordance with the district and state, Jonathan Jennings Elementary School has adopted the newest version of Indiana College and Career Ready Standards as its curriculum. GCCS formed a cadre of teachers to create grade level pacing guides. These were distributed for use in planning the Goal Clarity lessons, rubrics, and exemplars. Teachers also bring pacing guides to use at all articulation meetings. Each grade level team was given a printed binder copy of the new pacing guides. All lessons and assessments are planned from the adopted and unpacked standards within the pacing guides and the IDOE maps. As a focus of curriculum and instruction, Jonathan Jennings Elementary School continues to use a Balanced Math Framework as the primary means of mathematics instruction. A Balanced Literacy Framework, developed by JJES, is the primary means of teaching reading/language arts. We also continue to emphasize the 5 components of reading--phonemic awareness, phonics, vocabulary, reading comprehension, and fluency during our 90 minute reading block. A modified gradual release is implemented with the reading block. We also continue to implement the McGraw Hill Math series. In addition, our students study science and social studies. Other areas of the curriculum include art, music and physical education. All instruction is again based on the Goal Clarity form of planning. Special needs students receive services through the practice of inclusion for all subjects. They are pulled out for small group and individualized instruction in reading/language arts and math. Interventions that were implemented in the 2015-2016 school year: At risk fourth and fifth grade students were chosen to participate in either System 44 or the Read 180 on-line programs. We have continued the use of the System 44 and Read 180 programs. JJES teachers provide

small group interventions within each day for all grade levels. We also provide Tier II and Tier III daily by 1.5 staff members through our CIS program, additional small groups are formed and individual instruction occurs. In 2011-12 we began Math intervention based on our Goal Clarity assessment results during semester 2. For the 2015-2016 school year, we have continued Math intervention based on GCS assessments and STAR data. We have a number of programs to extend learning beyond the regular school day/year. In previous years funds have been available to have remediation programs that focus on preparing students for ISTEP+ and reviewing key concepts and strategies that will help them be more successful on the tests. The students of Jonathan Jennings Elementary also receive tutoring through our Community in Schools Program. This is a program which meets 4 days per week for students in grades 1st through 5th.

**ISTEP+**

JJES	2009	2010	2011	2012	2013	2014	2015	2016
ELA	67%	74%	86%	84%	89.9%	86%	70%	72%
MATH	63%	75%	80%	84%	85%	87%	65%	64%
BOTH	54%	65%	73%	75%	79%	80%	55%	

Student Demographics

The current population of Jonathan Jennings Elementary School is 497 students. This is an increase in the number of students enrolled at Jonathan Jennings in a number of years. Our current population is average: 5% African American, 9% Hispanic, 79% White/Non Hispanic, and 6% Multiracial. In the fall of 2007, 54.87% of the students received free and reduced lunch. In the spring of 2016, 56% of the students are receiving free and reduced lunch.

Cultural Competencies

Through our vision at Jonathan Jennings, every child will have a value added education every year. We continue to provide all students a challenging curriculum that promotes excellence in academics and social skills. Using school data we will formulate our areas of concern and make plans for our next steps.

Parent Participation

Jonathan Jennings has a very supportive and engaged Parent Teacher Organization. In addition, we have added the 3 For Me parent volunteer program this school year. This program invites parents to volunteer for committees that allow parents/grandparents to volunteer during the school day and also in the evenings and on the weekends. It has a focus to include all cultural backgrounds and

genders. At our End of Year Program, our volunteers will be recognized for their time and commitment to the school.

### Attendance

School Learning Climate Our attendance rate for 2015-2016 stands at 96%.

### Safe and Orderly Environment (PRIDE)

In accordance with state laws and Jonathan Jennings Elementary School's Emergency Preparedness Plan, classes at our school will discuss emergencies and will participate in periodic safety drills. The purpose of each drill is to teach the children how to respond quickly and safely in the event of an emergency. Emergency information is located in each room in the building. Evacuation procedures are also posted throughout the school.

**Fire Drills:** The purpose of the fire drill is to teach the children how to evacuate the building in a rapid, orderly, and safe manner. These are held monthly.

**Tornado Drills:** Students are taught to take shelter in a structurally sound location on the first floor of the building with no windows. Students sit on the ground and place his/her hands on their heads. Tornado drills are scheduled each semester.

**Intruder/Man-made Drills:** These drills are also scheduled regularly during the year. Students and teachers "take cover" to get out of harm's way should an intruder be on school grounds or other potentially harmful situation that constitutes appropriate action to ensure safety.

These emergency drills will be done under the direction of the principal with records of these drills being kept in the principal's office. Drills are taken very seriously. During severe weather, we stay tuned to the National Weather Service for up-to-the-minute reports. If severe weather occurs at dismissal time, we will hold the buses until the transportation department deems that it is safe for children to be transported home. Parents may be asked to wait until severe weather passes before transporting their child home in a car.

## **PRIDE**

All students follow the Pirate PRIDE positive support plan at Jonathan Jennings. Utilizing the matrix developed by our staff and students, all areas of the school building have behavior expectations in place. Students are taught the character traits of PRIDE (Persistence, Responsibility, Initiative, Dependability, and Efficiency) within all subjects in the classroom. Each day we state the Pirate Pride pledge on morning announcements and all rewards/consequences are aligned with one of the PRIDE traits. The PRIDE support plan allows us to maintain a safe and orderly environment in our school.

## **Technology**

Students at Jonathan Jennings grade 3-5 are involved in the 1 to 1 initiative in our district, which provides every student with a Chromebook. Utilizing our technology teacher in the special area rotation, students grades K-5 receive a minimum of one computer lab per week as well as technology integration in the classroom. We have incorporated ongoing professional development for technology in our weekly team meetings to enhance usage for teachers. This professional development will help to attract high quality, highly qualified teachers to this school. Students complete an Easy Tech assessment at the end of fifth grade to determine their level of knowledge. Students use Chromebooks daily to support learning on an individual basis, with partners, group work, online assignments and projects.

## **Curriculum and Instruction**

GCCS curriculum is aligned with state standards. Curriculum information is located in the main office as well as on the Greater Clark County Website. All certified staff has been trained and using the Greater Clark Pacing Guide for their grade level. Elementary teachers in grades K-5 have pacing guides for: Language Arts, Math, Science, and Social Studies which are aligned to the 2014 Indiana College and Career Standards. Maps. Performance data linked to the maps is routinely reviewed to guide process for improving instruction and aligning the formative -assessment process. Curriculum development occurs in the following areas:

Language Arts  
Mathematics  
Science/Health  
Social Studies  
Library Media Skills  
Music

Art  
Physical Education  
Technology Education

In order to understand the level of implementation of key programs and strategies, implementation data are collected and analyzed as evidenced by observations, walk-throughs, collaboration, and student work samples. Students failing ISTEP+ participate in remediation during the school day, after school programs and/or intersession. Supplemental programs are monitored and evaluated with assessments. Student grades and report cards are aligned with Indiana Academic Standards and ISTEP+ as evidenced by correlations of student grades with scores on ISTEP+. The interventions that will address critical areas will include: full -day kindergarten, tiered small group instruction (IMPACT Groups), extended school year (Intercessions), the use of class -size reductions teachers, and after school programming run by Communities in Schools.

### *Titles and Descriptions of Assessment Instruments*

#### **ELA Reading/Writing:**

**Writing Benchmark Assessments** – These assessments focus on Indiana College and Career State Standards. They provide students with exposure to writing prompts in specific genres. Teachers score the writing assessments with the Indiana Writing Rubric (Gr. 2-5) and a 6 Traits Writing Rubric (Gr. K-1). Kdg. – Gr. 5 teachers administer, score and analyze Writing Assessments four times per year.

**Aimswab** - Gr. K -1 teachers administer Aimswab Literacy screening 3 times per year. Students who score red/yellow on Aimswab Reading screening will be progress monitored using Aimswab every two weeks.

**STAR** - Gr 2-5 teachers will administer STAR Reading screening 3 times per year. Students who score red/yellow on STAR Reading screening will be progress monitored using STAR Reading every two weeks.

**Running Records** - (K-2) Teachers will administer running records using McGraw Hill benchmark and progress monitoring materials or other similar materials to determine a guided reading level for those students. Students will be progress monitored using running records at least monthly.

**Common Quarterly Assessments** – Grades K-5 teachers utilize CQA assessments aligned to standards and a corporation prescribed pacing of skills/standards on a biweekly basis to assess ELA standards taught. Students not meeting mastery level on the CQA and Learning Check assessments will be remediated in small group and given the opportunity to retake assessments following remediation.

**Math:**

**Aimsweb** - Gr. K -1 teachers administer Aimsweb Math screening 3 times per year. Students who score red/yellow on Aimsweb Math screening will be progress monitored using Aimsweb every two weeks.

**STAR** - Gr 2-5 teachers will administer STAR Math screening 3 times per year. Students who score red/yellow on STAR Reading screening will be progress monitored using STAR Math every two weeks.

**Technology:** 21st Century Skills - Grade 5 teachers administer and analyze technology skills results at the end of each school year.

## **Mission, Vision, and Beliefs**

**Mission:**

Lead GCCS Corporation in Academic Achievement.

**Vision:**

Every student has a value added education at our school.

**Beliefs:**

We will deliver on our promise to ensure all students are reading on level by Grade 3 utilizing academic frameworks.

We will change the future of Charlestown one student at a time.

At JJ, we find a way.

## **Leadership Team**

Adrienne Bach	Principal
Angela Smith	Academic Improvement Coordinator
Mari Harbin	Kindergarten Teacher
Sulayne Kaelin	Second Grade Teacher
Jill Richardson	Second Grade Teacher
Ashley Padgett	Special Needs Teacher
Jamie Spear	Fourth Grade Teacher
Aimee Doherty	Fifth Grade Teacher

## **Three-year Goals 2016-19**

### **Goal 1: English/Language Arts**

Goal: By spring 2019  $\geq$  80% of students in grades 3-5 will meet State Standard in ELA as measured by ISTEP+/ISTAR.

Goal: By spring 2019  $\geq$  90% of students in grades 3 will meet State Standard in Reading as measured by IREAD3.

Benchmark

Create 2017 Goals based on Sub-group and/or growth

### **Goal 2: Mathematics**

Goal: By spring 2019  $\geq$  80% of students in grades 3-5 will meet State Standard in Mathematics as measured by ISTEP+/ISTAR.

Benchmark  
Create 2017 Goals based on Sub-group and/or growth

### **Goal 3: College and Career (PRIDE)**

Goal: By spring 2019  $\geq$  95% of students with no behavior referrals in grades K-5.

## **Data Summary and Action Plan**

### **Data Wise Action Plan**

---

**School: Jonathan Jennings Elementary School**

---

**Grade Level/Subject Area: K-5**

---

**Area of Focus: Literacy**

---

**Data: ISTEP+, STAR,**

---

**2016 ISTEP+ Performance (% of Students who Passed ELA ISTEP+): 72%**

**2017 ISTEP+ Performance Goal (% of Students who Passed ELA ISTEP+): 80%**

---

**2016 STAR (% of Students at Grade Level on Reading): 72%**

**2017 STAR Goal (% of Students at Grade Level Reading): 74%**

---

**2016 ELA CQA Mastery: 73%**

2017 ELA CQA Mastery Goal: 75%

---

**What is the Learner-Centered Problem?**

Students lack vocabulary and strategies needed for comprehension to understand text.

---

**What is the Problem of Practice?**

As teachers, we do not teach comprehension strategies and vocabulary explicitly to assist students with text in our Guided Reading lessons.

---

**What Instructional Strategy will be implemented to reach goal?**

Teachers will implement daily Guided Reading lessons with vocabulary and comprehension instruction to increase reading levels for all students including underserved populations.

---

<b>Task</b> (What specific tasks will you implement to reach goal?)	<b>When</b> (will you complete task?)	<b>Who</b> (will be responsible?) <b>Professional</b>
---	---------------------------------------	---

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● Literacy Framework implemented in all Core Reading Blocks</li> <li>● Review the GCCS Literacy Framework to Maximize Student Growth with daily vocab Lesson and Guided Reading Groups.</li> <li>● Use instructional reading levels to differentiate groups at their zone of proximal development.</li> <li>● Strengthen Core Reading Block by providing coaching support from AIC and District Literacy Coaches.</li> <li>● Professional Development team meetings on Comprehension scaffolds for Guided Reading, instruction on Framework and Coaching Support.</li> <li>● Professional Development on analyzing running records using reading strategies of meaning, visual, and structure</li> <li>● Period zero team meetings with our building Literacy experts to model guided reading lessons.</li> <li>● Leveled library will be organized by Reading</li> </ul>	<p>Quarter 1</p> <p>Quarter 1 and ongoing</p> <p>End of Quarter 1 -Sept 30</p> <p>Quarter 1 and ongoing</p> <p>End of Quarter 2 - Dec. 16th</p> <p>End of Quarter 2 - Dec. 16</p> <p>Monthly - literacy focus on PD calendar.</p> <p>End of Quarter 2 - Dec. 16th</p>	<p>Principal, AIC, Building Leadership Team, District Literacy Coaches, all staff members.</p> <p>AIC, Literacy BLT Team and district literacy coaches</p> <p>AIC reading coach</p> <p>AIC and district literacy coaches</p> <p>Principal and AIC reading coach</p> <p>AIC and district literacy coaches</p> <p>AIC, BLT leaders 1st, 2nd, and Special Needs</p> <p>3 for Me Volunteer Committee</p>
--	---	--

<p>Recovery levels and Lexile levels and added to as money permits.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● Review quarterly data of reading progress at data meetings.</li> </ul>	<p>October, January, and June</p>	<p>Principal, media clerk and AIC</p> <p>Principal, AIC and classroom teachers</p>
---	-----------------------------------	--

## Data Summary and Action Plan

### Data Wise Action Plan

---

**School: Jonathan Jennings Elementary**

---

**Grade Level/Subject Area: K-5**

---

**Area of Focus: Mathematics**

---

**Data: ISTEP+. STAR**

---

**2016 ISTEP+ Performance (% of Students who Passed Math ISTEP+): 64%**

**2017 ISTEP+ Performance Goal (% of Students who Passed Math ISTEP+): 80%**

---

**2016 STAR (% of Students at Grade Level in Math): 79%**

**2017 STAR Goal (% of Students at Grade Level in Math): 81%**

---

2016 Math CQA Mastery: 77%  
 2017 Math CQA Mastery Goal: 80%

---

**What is the Learner-Centered Problem?**

Students lack the appropriate knowledge of number sense needed to be successful with the current math standards across grade levels.

---

**What is the Problem of Practice?**

We currently are not providing enough explicit teaching/opportunities for students to engage in the Depth of Knowledge necessary to comprehend key concepts/ideas in the area of mathematics.

---

**What Instructional Strategy will be implemented to reach goal?**

Utilize the 2016-2017 Daily Math Review guidelines to ensure key concepts are taught in the classrooms. Teachers will emphasize a focus on reflections, mental math, Math categories and stating key concepts for deeper understanding.

---

<b>Task</b> (What specific tasks will you implement to reach goal?)	<b>When</b> (will you complete task?)	<b>Who</b> (will be responsible?)
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● Provide DMR Professional Development using the 2016-2017 Procedures and Framework with staff.</li> <li>● Professional Development team meetings on DMR, Number Sense, key concepts, and reflections</li> <li>● Utilize classroom walkthroughs to monitor DMR fidelity during Math block</li> </ul>	.Quarter 1 and ongoing as needed	Principal, AIC, Building Leadership Team, Math Coaches, and all staff members.
	Monthly - math focus on PD calendar.	AIC, BLT leaders 5st and 1st
	Q1 and ongoing	Principal and AIC

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● Monitor use of Poster Method in all grade levels.</li> <li>● Utilize Math coaches in the building to collect and provide feedback on DMR quizzes for all classrooms.</li> <li>● Review quarterly data of math progress at data meetings.</li> </ul>	Q1 and ongoing	Principal and Math Coaches
	Q1 and ongoing	Math Coaches
	October, January, and June	Principal, AIC and classroom teachers

## Data Summary and Action Plan

### Data Wise Action Plan

---

**School:** Jonathan Jennings Elementary

---

**Grade Level/Subject Area:** K-5

---

**Area of Focus:** PRIDE

---

**Data:** Behavior Referrals

---

**2016 PRIDE Results (Behavior Referrals):** 133

---

**2017 PRIDE Goal (Behavior Referrals):** 107

---

**What is the Learner-Centered Problem?**

Some students lack an understanding of PRIDE expectations.

---

**What is the Problem of Practice?**

As a building, we need to improve our consistency with our PBIS reward system and use of PRIDE daily IMPACT time in the classroom.

---

**What Instructional Strategy will be implemented to reach goal?**

Increase the amount of explicit teaching and modeling of PRIDE expectations in the classroom.

---

<b>Task</b> (What specific tasks will you implement to reach goal?)	<b>When</b> (will you complete task?)	<b>Who</b> (will be responsible?)
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● Continue to provide tools and resources to staff members through period zero team meetings in the area of PRIDE expectations.</li> <li>● Utilize our PRIDE Behavior Impact team and school psychologist to provide additional support for students in tier 2 and tier 3.</li> <li>● Provide guidelines regarding our PBIS plan to increase consistency across the building.</li> <li>● Professional development on Rubric and lesson resources in team meetings and PBIS committee meetings.</li> </ul>	<p>Monthly - PBIS focus on PD calendar.</p> <p>Q1 and ongoing</p> <p>Q1 and ongoing</p> <p>Q1 and ongoing</p>	<p>Principal and PBIS team</p> <p>AIC, Impact team, and School psychologist</p> <p>PBIS team</p> <p>Principal and AIC</p>

## Elementary Summary Sheet for Key ISTEP+ Data

**English/Language Arts (ELA)**

**Mathematics (Math)**

**ELA - OVERALL**

Number of students passing/total assessed (%)  
 From each "Disaggregation Summary Report"

Grade	Spring 14	Spring 15	Spring 16
3	65/79=82%	66/90=73%	56/79=70.9%
4	73/85=86%	51/71=72%	60/91=65.9%
5	60/70=86%	59/90=66%	54/69=78.3%
Total	198/234=85%	176/251=70%	170/239=71.1%

**MATH - OVERALL**

Number of students passing/total assessed (%)  
 From each "Disaggregation Summary Report"

Grade	Spring 14	Spring 15	Spring 16
3	61/79=77%	48/90=53%	40/79=50.6%
4	71/85=84%	50/71=70%	52/91=57.1%
5	69/70=99%	64/90=71%	59/69=85.5%
Total	201/234=86%	162/251=65%	151/239=63.2%

**ELA - KEY SUBGROUPS: Grade 3**

Number of students passing/total assessed (%)

Group	Spring 14	Spring 15	Spring 16
Sp Ed	6/10=60%	7/18=39%	
Free/Red	27/39=69%	28/49=57%	
LEP	*/9	*/5	
Black	*/2	*/3	
White	51/57=89%	56/72=78%	

**MATH - KEY SUBGROUPS: Grade 3**

Number of students passing/total assessed (%)

Group	Spring 14	Spring 15	Spring 16
Sp Ed	5/10=50%	3/18=17%	
Free/	24/39=62%	23/49=47%	
LEP	*/9	*/5	
Black	*2	*/3	
White	46/57=81%	41/72=57%	

**ELA - KEY SUBGROUPS: Grade 4**

Number of students passing/total assessed (%)

Group	Spring 14	Spring 15	Spring 16
Sp Ed	*/9	4/10=40%	
Free/Red	33/43=77%	16/31=52%	
LEP	*/8	*/7	
Black	*/3	*/1	
White	63/73=86%	41/57=72%	

**MATH - KEY SUBGROUPS: Grade 4**

Number of students passing/total assessed (%)

Group	Spring 14	Spring 15	Spring 16
Sp Ed	*/9	4/10=40%	
Free/Red	32/43=74%	16/31=52%	
LEP	*/8	*/7	
Black	*/3	*/1	
White	62/73=85%	39/57=68%	

**ELA - KEY SUBGROUPS: Grade 5**

Number of students passing/total assessed (%)

Group	Spring 14	Spring 15	Spring 16
Sp Ed	*/8	4/16=25%	
Free/Red	29/38=78%	24/47=51%	

**MATH - KEY SUBGROUPS: Grade 5**

Number of students passing/total assessed (%)

Group	Spring 14	Spring 15	Spring 16
Sp Ed	*/8	4/16=25%	
Free/Red	36/37=97%	25/47=53%	

LEP	*/9	4/10=40%	
Black	*/3	*/3	
White	44/50=88%	52/76=68%	

LEP	*/9	6/10=60%	
Black	*/3	*/3	
White	49/50=98%	56/76=74%	

**ELA-TOTAL SUBGROUPS: All Grades**

Number of students passing/total assessed (%)

Group	Spring 14	Spring 15	Spring 16
Sp Ed	12/27=44%	15/44=34%	
Free/Red	89/120=74%	68/127=54%	
LEP	20/26=77%	11/22=50%	
Black	8/8=100%	*/7	
White	158/180=88%	149/205=73%	

**MATH-TOTAL SUBGROUPS: All Grades**

Number of students passing/total assessed (%)

Group	Spring 14	Spring 15	Spring 16
Sp Ed	17/27=63%	11/44=25%	
Free/Red	92/119=77%	64/127=50%	
LEP	21/26=81%	14/22=64%	
Black	7/8=88%	*/7	
White	157/180=87%	136/205=66%	

**Science**

**SCIENCE - OVERALL**

Number of students passing/total assessed (%)

From each "Disaggregation Summary Report"

Grade*	Spring 14	Spring 15	Spring 16
4	69/85=81%	46/71=65%	56/91=61.5%
Total	69/85=81%	46/71=65%	56/91=61.5%

**Social Studies**

**SOCIAL STUDIES - OVERALL**

Number of students passing/total assessed (%)

From each "Disaggregation Summary Report"

Grade*	Spring 14	Spring 15	Spring 16
5	55/70=79%	N/A	50/69=72.5%
Total	55/70=79%	N/A	50/69=72.5%

**Science - KEY SUBGROUPS: Grade 4  
5**

Number of students passing/total assessed (%)

Group	Spring 14	Spring 15	Spring 16
Sp Ed	*/9	3/10=30%	
Free/Red	29/43=67%	13/31=42%	

**Social Studies - KEY SUBGROUPS: Grade**

Number of students passing/total assessed (%)

Group	Spring 14	Spring 15	Spring 16
Sp Ed	*/8	N/A	
Free/Red	25/37=68%	N/A	

LEP	*/8	*/7	
Black	*/3	*/1	
White	61/73=84%	37/57=65%	

LEP	*/9	N/A	
Black	*/3	N/A	
White	40/50=80%	N/A	

Three - Year Data	District 3-Year			Goal	
	2011-12	2012-13	2013-14	2014-15	2015-2016
IREAD 3					
% of students passing IREAD3	84.3%	91.4%	91.6%	93.6%	94.9%

## School Goals and PL221 Summary 2015-16

**School: Jonathan Jennings Elementary**

Goal 1 - ELA	District AYP	School AYP	PI 221 Plan	School AYP	PI 221 Plan	PI 221 Plan
	2014-15 Scores	2014-15 Scores	2015-16 Goals	2015-16 Scores	2016-2017 Goals	Strategies

Passing Rate	63.8%	71.7%	73%	72%	74%	The Frayer model will be used at all grade levels to enhance the learning of new or familiar vocabulary words. Teachers will identify student needs in the areas of literacy to review on a daily assignment until mastery is met through the use of rubrics and exemplars.
% Growth Bottom 25% Target 42.5%	40%	44.7%	45%	TBA		
% Growth Top 75% Target 36.2%	33.2%	39.8%	42%	TBA		
IREAD Passing	92.6%	92.3%	95%	94.9%	96.9%	
<b>Goal 2 - Math</b>	<b>District AYP</b>	<b>School AYP</b>	<b>PI 221 Plan</b>	<b>School AYP</b>	<b>PI 221 Plan</b>	<b>PI 221 Plan</b>
	<b>2014-15 Scores</b>	<b>2014-15 Scores</b>	<b>2015-16 Goals</b>	<b>2015-16 Scores</b>	<b>2016-2017 Goals</b>	<b>Strategies</b>
Passing Rate	56%	66.8%	67%	64%	70%	DMR used daily focused on specific student needs. Problem Solving from Balanced Math will requires students to complete written and verbal responses based on error analysis. Key ideas, vocabulary and reflections will be included daily.
% Growth Bottom 25% Target 44.9%	36.6%	52.6%	55%	TBA		
% Growth Top 75% Target 39.2%	33.9%	50.5%	53%	TBA		
<b>Goal 3 - PRIDE Behavior/ Attendance</b>	<b>District AYP</b>	<b>School AYP</b>	<b>PI 221 Plan</b>	<b>School AYP</b>	<b>PI 221 Plan</b>	<b>PI 221 Plan</b>
	<b>2014-15 Scores</b>	<b>2014-15 Scores</b>	<b>2015-16 Goals</b>	<b>2015-16 Scores</b>	<b>2016-2017 Goals</b>	<b>Strategies</b>
% student w/no Referral	94.6%	93.1%	95%	90.2%	92.2%	Students will participate in a daily 15 min. PRIDE lesson focusing on PRIDE rubric

% Student Attendance	95.1%	95.5%	95%	95.7%	97%	Students will receive quarterly incentives for demonstrating PRIDE qualities.
% Students w/ all 2's			50%	49.6%	51.6%	
% Gr. 5 w/ Work Ethic Certificate			50%	36%	50%	

No statutes and/or rules  
will be waived by

---

Elementary School.

Fall, 2016

# Year

## Appendix

### **Comprehensive Needs Assessment Overview**

An updated comprehensive needs assessment of all students in the school, including subgroups was used to review and revise the school wide comprehensive plan to improve teaching and learning. The needs assessment includes data collection and analysis as well as integration with key teaching strategies. The plan was developed in consultation with Director for Curriculum and Instruction, Supervisor for Assessment, Title I Supervisor, and Supervisor for School Improvement, Informational Services Coordinator, and Supervisor for Student Support Services, Director of Special Education and Bi-lingual Education. Parents, community members, teachers, and administrators will participate in reviewing and updating the plan through PL221 school wide planning committee meetings.

Collaboration at grade level and cross grade level meetings, all staff provided input to the development of the plan. The process and plan was and will be shared with parents during parent training opportunities and annual meetings.

The Jonathan Jennings SWP/ PL221 School Improvement Plan is shared on the school's website for access by parents and community members. Parents, community members, teachers, and administrators will participate in reviewing and updating the plan through PL221 school wide planning meetings. Results, analysis, and recommendations for improvement will be reported on Summative Assessment forms within the plan. The plan will be evaluated annually to determine whether the key strategies of the school wide program have increased the achievement of students, particularly the students who are the lowest achievers of academic standards on ISTEP+. Evaluation results are used to make necessary revisions to the plan.

Jonathan Jennings utilizes a common 45 minute planning time for K-5 teachers once a week and two 40 minute staff professional development meetings a week. Common planning time and professional development biweekly will help to attract high-quality, highly qualified teachers to this school. Special faculty meetings are often scheduled to address management issues.

## Assessment

**Assessment Q1.** How many/what % of students meet state standards? Have mastered which skills?

Answer: Building wide totals for 2009-2010 in ISTEP+=ELA was 74% overall, and Math was 75% overall.

Data Statement:

Using current year Acuity data: 71% of 3<sup>rd</sup> graders, 68% of 4<sup>th</sup> graders, and 76% of 5<sup>th</sup> graders are meeting state standards in English/Language Arts.

Using the same test data: 66% of 3<sup>rd</sup> graders, 64% of 4<sup>th</sup> graders, and 78% of 5<sup>th</sup> graders are meeting state standards in Math .

**Assessment Q2. Are some groups not performing as well as others?**

Answer: Yes-our subgroups are not performing as well as our majority group of white/Caucasian population.

Data Statements: :

ISTEP+ ELA 2010 26% of students did not pass. 44% of special needs students did not pass. 37% of free/reduced lunch students did not pass.

ISTEP+ Math 2010 25% of students did not pass. 46% of special needs students did not pass. 25% of free/reduced lunch students did not pass.

**Assessment Q3. What are the critical errors made by students below mastery?**

Answer: Critical errors are reading comprehension and multi step math problem solutions.

Data Statements:

**Assessment Q4. Are students showing adequate yearly progress; are #s of students not-passing decreasing/fewer?**

Answer: Students are showing AYP and in 2010 student overall % of not passing did decrease.

Data Statement:

Based on ISTEP + data:

ELA 2009 64% of students passed  
Math 2009 62% of students passed  
ELA 2010 74% of students passed (+ 10%)  
Math 2010 75% of students passed (+ 13%)

**Assessment Q5. How well are students meeting standards in non-ISTEP+ grades? Errors?**

Answer:

Students are performing well in non-ISTEP grades based on Dibels and GCW assessments.

The key errors were phonemic awareness, handwriting, spelling, making up story problems, comparing and sorting shapes, knowing morning, afternoon, yesterday, tomorrow, choosing the approach to solve a problem, using self correction strategies when reading. While some students were not proficient at other standards, the percentage not meeting each of those standards was less than 30%.

The key errors were: Comma usage, Time, Measurement, Fact Families, Plot, Setting, Characters, Beginning, Middle, and End.

Data Statements:

Of the 57 Kindergarteners, 95% or more did not master standards k.1.7, k.1.8, k.1.18, and k.6.1. Between 79% and 90% of the students did not master standards k.1.16, k.6.2, k.2.3, k.4.2, k.5.1, k.5.2, and k.6.1.

Of the 32 standards analyzed on Goal Clarity Windows in 1<sup>st</sup> and 2<sup>nd</sup> grades, 19 standards were mastered by 80% or more of the students.

**Assessment Q6. How many students read at/above gr. level? W/ comprehension?**

Answer: A high % of students read at or above grade level.

Data Statement:

Kindergarten: 63/65 (97%)

First Grade: 54/75 (72%)

Second Grade: 55/69 (80%)

Third Grade: 37/72 (51%)

Fourth Grade: 39/75 (52%)

Fifth Grade: 47/65 (72%)

**Assessment Q7. Do students w/ As, Bs, & Cs on report cards pass ISTEP+ (elem)?**

Answer 10%-25%, depending on grade level and subject area, do not pass ISTEP+ but do pass by their classroom report card scores.

Data Statements:

In 2010, 81% of 3<sup>rd</sup> graders earned A's, B's and C's in Language Arts and passed the ELA portion of ISTEP. 19% had A's, B's and C's but did not pass.

In 2010, 75% of 3<sup>rd</sup> graders earned A's, B's and C's in Math and passed the Math portion of ISTEP. 25% had A's, B's and C's but did not pass.

In 2010, 87% of 4<sup>th</sup> graders earned A's, B's and C's in Language Arts and passed the ELA portion of ISTEP. 13% had A's, B's and C's but did not pass.

In 2010, 90% of 4<sup>th</sup> graders earned A's, B's and C's in Math but did not pass the Math portion of ISTEP. 10% had A's, B's and C's but did not pass.

**Assessment Q9. How well prepared do Kdg. Students come to school?**

Answer:

About 1/3 of students entering kindergarten qualified for Intervention.

Data Statements:

**Reading:**

44/65 (68%) students came into kindergarten able to recognize at least 20 letters out of 52 (capital and lowercase). 21/65 (32%) students needed intervention.

26/65 (40%) students received extra support with interventionist during the 2009-2010 school year.

24/26 (86%) students that received extra support with interventionist were at benchmark by the end of the year. (The two students that did not make it to benchmark were retained.)

**Math:**

14/64 (22%) students came into kindergarten able to recognize numbers 1-20.

18/64 (28%) students came into kindergarten able to write numbers 1-20.

46/64 (72%) students came into kindergarten able to count to 20

## Culture

**Culture Q1. Are culturally appropriate strategies utilized in classrooms (racial, ethnic, language-minority, cultural, exceptional learning, and socioeconomic groups)?**

Answer: Teachers receive training and most have aware of culturally appropriate strategies and lessons.

Data Statements:

12/25 teachers are trained in 6-Parck (ESL program)

Art and Music projects focus on cultural awareness.

**Culture Q2. Is the number of student disruptions kept to a minimum so that learning time for students is maximized?**

Answer: Meetings with teachers must be scheduled to not interfere with classroom instructional time. Dismissal changes are made to each room in the last 10 minutes of the day

Data Statements:

All announcements are made from the office at only the beginning and end of the day, unless severe emergency arises.

**Culture Q3. Do we have a safe learning environment?**

Answer: JJES does have and promote a safe learning environment.

Data Statements

< 5% of office referrals are for unsafe behavior

**Culture Q4. How well are our rules or procedures for behavior followed?**

Answer:

Data shows that rules and procedures for proper behavior are mainly followed.

Data Statements:

100% of staff and students are aware of “The JJ Way”-behavior plan.

**Culture Q5. How do we inform families about state standards, student performance, grade level expectations, class policies & procedures?**

Answer

There is weekly and monthly communication from the school to the homes

Data Statements:

100% signed parent compacts and report cards.

20/20 classrooms send home weekly/monthly happenings.

Minimum of one monthly newsletter from the Principal.

Parental phone calls are either made and returned in a timely manner,

**Culture Q6. What level of attendance do we have at parent conf. Open house, other?**

Answer: JJES has high levels of parent participation

Data Statements:

100% of parent contact at conferences.

95%+ attend conferences in person.

-5% communicated by phone or note

**Culture Q7. What business partnerships do we have? With what outcomes? Role in decision-making?**

Answer: Our school qualifies for services from CIS (Community in Schools, 21<sup>st</sup> Century Scholars)

We are also served by the CEEF council (Charlestown Excellence in Education Foundation)

Data Statements:

100% of F/R Lunch children are eligible for CIS services.

32/475 students participate in Blessings in a Backpack.

13/475 students participate in the 21<sup>st</sup> Century Program

100% of students benefit from CEEF-Charlestown Initiative

## Curriculum

**Curriculum Q1. Is curriculum aligned with state standards? Instruction? Are curriculum maps completed, reviewed and updated regularly?**

- Answer: In accordance with district and state guidelines, Jonathan Jennings has adopted the Indiana Academic Standards as the curriculum. Curriculum is aligned with state standards and instruction using the State Core Standards for K-5 with Goal Clarity Windows, Jonathan Jennings Math Facts scope and sequences, and Daily Balanced Math and Literacy Review scope and sequences.

Data Statement:

19/19 classroom teachers were surveyed and 19/19 or 100% of classroom teacher's curriculum is aligned with the Indiana state standards.

100% of teachers are creating goal clarity windows on a weekly basis with their grade level. Windows are being created using the state core standards and reviewed by Goal Clarity/Mapping Consultant. Windows for each week can be viewed by visiting [gcs.rubiconatlas.org](http://gcs.rubiconatlas.org)

**Curriculum Q2. Is staff fully implementing key programs trained in?**

Answer: Staff is implementing daily balanced math and literacy reviews and goal clarity windows.

Data to prove implementation will come from the schedule, Goal Clarity Window results, Walkthroughs, Indiana Reading Framework, Daily balanced math and literacy review results turned into grade level leaders.

Data Statements:

19/19 teachers were surveyed and 19/19 or 100% of teachers teach whole group and small reading groups during the 90 minute reading block.

16/19 or 84% of teachers have implemented reading stations in their 90 minute reading block.

18/19 or 95% of teachers use writer's workshop during their 45 min. writing block.

19/19 or 100% of teachers conduct daily intervention-Tier 2.

19/19 or 100% of teachers do daily balanced math and literacy in their classrooms.

**Curriculum Q3. How are Goal Clarity Windows being used?**

Answer:GCW are being used to plan all instruction , creation, and storage of lesson plans , assessments, and rubrics.

Data Statement:

100% of teachers are creating goal clarity windows on a weekly basis with their grade level. Windows are being created using the state core standards and reviewed by Goal Clarity/Mapping Consultant. Windows for each week can be viewed by visiting [gcs.rubiconatlas.org](http://gcs.rubiconatlas.org)

**Curriculum Q4. Are rubrics and exemplars being developed and used by teachers AND Students: Are state rubrics posted and used by students?**

Answer: Rubric training and discussions has occurred..

Each grade level has created and implemented the use of rubrics in their classroom through goal clarity windows.

Data Statements:

54% of teachers are using rubrics to assess word problems, and 23% have students self-assess using rubrics in math.

79% of teachers are using rubrics to assess writing prompts, and 50% have students self-assess using rubrics in ELA  
19/19 teachers were surveyed and 18/19 or 95% of teachers use rubrics on a weekly or bi-weekly basis.  
9/18 or 50% of teachers use rubrics more than once per week.  
19/19 or 100% of teachers use exemplary work as expectations/models for their student.

**Curriculum Q5. Are students provided technology classes? How often? How assessed?**

Answer: Students are provided technology classes each week.  
Grades K-3 receives classes 1 time per week.  
Grades 4-5 receive classes 2 times per week.

Data Statement:

Students have a lack of standardized technology curriculum for grades K-5  
Grades K-3 receives classes 1 time per week.  
Grades 4-5 receive classes 2 times per week.  
Third graders take a Tech Literacy Assessment on the computer. This is a computer based assessment with multiple choice and application based questions. 4% (3/72) passed the assessment.

**Curriculum Q6. How many/what percent of students are enrolled in Advanced Placement and or Honor courses? Served by the corporation's highly Able program?**

Answer: A low % of students at JJES have qualified for the Highly Able program,

Data Statement:

1% (3/476) students are served by the corporation's Highly Able Program.

## Intervention

**Intervention Q1. Are extended time interventions (i.e., tutoring, summer school, supplemental classes) increasing student learning?**

Answer: According to our Intervention Model-Yes

Data statements: -100% of qualifying students are served by Tier II and III during each school day

-12/12 5<sup>th</sup> graders and 11/11 4<sup>th</sup> graders in Read 180 improved their lexile scores from BOY to MOY assessment  
-30-45 mins, outside of core, is utilized in each grade level every day for ELA and for Math

**Intervention Q2. What data is used to identify students, programs and personnel for our intervention program?**

Answer: Dibels data, lexile scores, acuity scores for each round, prior year ISTEP+ data, GCW results

Data Statements:

- 100% of students not passing Spring ISTEP+ were identified and receive Tier II and Tier III as needed
- Core/Tier I is received from the classroom teacher
- Acuity results and GCW results/data is used to group and place as necessary.

**Intervention Q3. How often is student data reviewed for intervention groups?**

Answer:

Weekly grade level meetings allow for GCW review. Standardized test data is reviewed as soon as available ( Acuity, SRI, ISTEP+,etc.)

Data Statements:

- 100% of students participate in GCW work and assessments
- 100% of teachers attend weekly grade level meetings with principal and Title 1 coordinator.
- 3/3 interventionists meet with each grade level served at least monthly.

**Intervention Q4. How is intervention data communicated with the regular classroom teacher?**

Answer: Grade level meetings are held with Interventionists no less than once a month. Meetings are called earlier whenever necessary.

Data Statements:

- 100% of Progress Monitoring data , i.e SRI data for Read 180 and System 44 students, Dibels, Scott Foreman, etc. is shared for each testing session.
- Any meeting can be called to discuss changed to Intervention.

**Intervention Q5. What methods are used to evaluate and track the effectiveness of intervention initiatives?**

Answer: All interventionists keep data on each child. Classroom teachers collect and monitor their own flexible groups. Read 180 and System 44 create and track each student on the systems.

Data Statement:

- 16/20 (80%) of teachers agree that the school core and intervention schedule enhances learning
- 18/20 (90%) of teachers agree that the school schedule enhances time on task

## Pedagogy

**Pedagogy Q1. Is consistent language & strategies used across grades & classes within grades?**

Answer:

Yes it is. Examples would be Balanced Math, Balanced Literacy, Exemplar/Problem Solving, Poster Method, 12 Powerful Words, Small Flexible reading groups, Tier Intervention, Rubrics, Word Walls, Self-Assessment, 4 square

Data Statements:

Based on walkthrough, MRF reports, GCW planning meetings and online postings 9/11 above are utilized in +90% of the grade levels and classrooms.

**Pedagogy Q2. How much time is spent in teach, guided practice, independent practice?**

Answer: Building walk-throughs are conducted with superintendent as scheduled, during grade-level planning walks, and/or just by the principal. Discussion following centers on the items of T, GP, and IP. JJES will continue to move instruction to GP.

Data Statements:

100% of staff have been a part of the discussion of T, GP, IP.

**Pedagogy Q3. What methodologies are used consistently in our building?**

Answer:

Writing= Graphic organizers, balanced math, monthly math review, weekly math review tests, balanced literacy, poster method for problem solving, rubrics in GCW, ISTEP+ writing rubrics  
I do, We do, You do, JJ Way

Data Statements:

100% of teachers use weekly math review sheets in some fashion

**Pedagogy Q4. Do we have guidelines for homework that are consistent in each classroom? How do we ensure guidelines are adhered to?**

Answer: Not shown to be consistent across the grade levels.

Data Statements:

Majority shows that students are graded on pass/not pass the skill, but not on the homework being completed.

**Pedagogy Q5. What strategies are used to ensure student engagement?**

Answer:

small groups, partners, technology in grades 3-5, verbal cues, physical cues, JJ Way, proximity, hocus pocus, positive reinforcement, dry erase, thumbs up and down sign language

Data Statement:

>90% of teachers use a signaling system of some kind within their classrooms daily.

## Planning

### Planning Q1. Do students have enough time to learn?

Answer: Students have enough time to learn.

Data Statement:

>5 hours of actual learning time each day.

≥90 minutes of reading, tier 2, and 60-75 minutes for math.

15/20 (75%) teachers agree that students have enough time to learn.

### Planning Q2. Does the school schedule enhance or hinder learning? Time on task?

Answer:

Our school schedule allows 90 minutes of *uninterrupted* reading time. This includes the mini-lesson, whole group, and small group instruction. Students are reading and participating in skill-related activities at all times.

Data Statements:

16/20 (80%) teachers agree that the school schedule enhances learning.

18/20 (90%) agree that the school schedule enhances time on task.

Comments made by those who think the schedule hinders:

- Too much time spent on testing.
- Too many pull-out programs.
- The schedule is choppy.
- Reading in the afternoon is hard for primary grades.
- We don't have enough time for math intervention

### Planning Q4. Are school improvement strategies monitored on a regular basis?

Answer:

The monitoring of school improvement strategies include:

Balanced math: weekly and biweekly assessments – results are analyzed.

Balanced literacy: weekly and biweekly assessments – results are analyzed.

Reading and math skills: weekly and Biweekly assessment. Results are analyzed by class and by grade-level as a whole.

Reading level: Students test quarterly, using SRI (Scholastic Reading Inventory). Students who are far below proficient are tested biweekly and students who are below proficient are tested monthly using DIBELS TRC progress monitoring.

Reading and math skills are also tested 3 times each year by Aimsweb (for grades k-1) and Acuity (for grades 2-5).

Data Statements:

20/20 (100%) teachers agree that school improvement strategies are monitored on a regular basis.

**Planning Q5. How is shared leadership demonstrated in the building? What opportunities are available for teacher leaders?**

Answer:

Each grade level, including the special needs department, has at least one team leader. These leaders have the opportunity to participate in biweekly meetings with the principal and Title I coordinator to discuss any questions, concerns, or to share information. Team leaders are able to share their opinions with the principal before many final decisions (regarding school functions) are made.

- **Teachers share areas of expertise.**
- **Leaders guide grade level teachers.**
- **Teachers lead sports and clubs.**
- **Great communication between grade level and school.**
- **Collaboration on planning.**
- **Opportunities to share ideas for improvement.**

**Balanced math and literacy leaders.**

Data Statements:

100% of grade levels and special populations department has representation on the building leadership team.

≥90% of professional development is performed by building staff members.

## **Professional Development**

**Professional Development Q1. What is the relationship of student achievement, state standards, & professional dev?**

Answer:

All Professional Development at JJES related to student achievement, best practices, GCW creations, and data discussion for planning.

Data Statement :

100% attend (at a minimum) 3/10 PD sessions each week.

**Professional Development Q2. What impact has PD had on classroom practice? How do we know? How do we evaluate impact?**

Answer: Professional development drives all GCW usage and data results.

Data Statements:

100% of grade level teachers plan common lessons and assessments each week

100% of PD is instructional in nature.

**Professional Development Q3. What kinds of collaboration exist? How effective is each?**

Answer:

Grade levels plan at least twice a week for GCW creation.  
 Interventionists collaborate with grade level teachers  
 Special population collaborate with grade level teachers  
 0 period allows for cross-grade level collaboration

Data Statements:  
 100% attend (at a minimum) 3/10 PD sessions each week  
 ≥90% of teachers state GCW are positive and effective.

**Professional Development Q4. Does PD increase cultural competency?**

Answer:  
 As a school, our PD reinforces competency in our building, due to discussion of research based instruction and common creation and usage of GCW.

Data Statements:  
 100% attend (at a minimum) 3/10 PD sessions each week.  
 100% of grade level teachers plan common lessons and assessments weekly.

**School Planning Review Team**

<b>NAME</b>	<b>POSITION</b>	<b>SIGNATURE</b>
<b>Adrienne Bach</b>	<b>Principal</b>	
<b>Angela Smith</b>	<b>AIC</b>	
<b>Mari Harbin</b>	<b>K Teacher</b>	
<b>Sulayne Kaelin</b>	<b>Second Grade</b>	
<b>Jill Richardson</b>	<b>Second Grade</b>	
<b>Ashley Padgett</b>	<b>Special Needs</b>	
<b>Jamie Spear</b>	<b>Fourth Grade</b>	
<b>Aimee Doherty</b>	<b>Fifth Grade</b>	
<b>Lori Blaydes</b>	<b>First Grade</b>	

--	--	--

### JJES - HOUSSE Summary Report GCCS

<b>First Name</b>	<b>Last Name</b>	<b>Teaching Assignment</b>	<b>Meets Highly Qualified Standard</b>	<b>Signed Document on File</b>
Melissa	Reed	K	HOUSSE	Yes
Mari	Harbin	K	Praxis II	Yes
Bev	Hughes	K	HOUSSE	Yes
Lori	Blaydes	1	HOUSSE	Yes
Alicia	McAfee	1	HOUSSE	Yes
Marge	Robison	1	HOUSSE	Yes
Cristie	Haire	2	HOUSSE	Yes
Sulayne	Kaelin	2	HOUSSE	Yes
Jillian	Richardson	2	HOUSSE	Yes
Rebecca	DeCamp	3	HOUSSE	Yes
Christina	Sonner	3	Praxis II	Yes
Julie	VanMeter	3	HOUSSE	Yes
Daniel	Dietrich	4	HOUSSE	Yes
JoAnn	Sawyer	4	HOUSSE/Praxis II	Yes
Jamie	Spear	4	Praxis II	Yes
Aimee	Doherty	5	HOUSSE	Yes
Christy	Elkin	5	Praxis II	Yes
Ronda	Hostetler	5	HOUSSE	Yes
Angela	Smith	AIC	HOUSSE	Yes
Amy	Short	Art/Music	HOUSSE	Yes
Beth	Day	Computers	HOUSSE/Praxis II	Yes
Dina	Schafer	ELL	HOUSSE/Praxis II	Yes
Jennifer	Hutton	SN	HOUSSE/Praxis II	Yes
Ashley	Padgett	SN	HOUSSE	Yes

<b>Anne</b>	<b>McElfresh</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>Praxis II</b>	<b>Yes</b>
<b>Diane</b>	<b>Welle</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>HOUSSE</b>	<b>Yes</b>

## Title I Schoolwide Plan Checklist

**Directions:** Review the Title I Schoolwide Plans prior to mailing to the IDOE to ensure that all requirements listed below have been met. Insert the page number where each component can be found in the column to the right. If a plan does not include all ten components, it is out of compliance with NCLB requirements and will need to be adjusted.

**Components of a Schoolwide Plan\*:**

Schoolwide Component	Page(s) Found in SIP
1. A comprehensive needs assessment of the whole school	pg 23
2. Implementation of schoolwide reform strategies that: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Provide opportunities for all children to meet proficient and advanced levels of students' academic achievement</li> <li>• Use effective methods and <u>instructional strategies</u> that are based on scientifically based research that:</li> <li>• Strengthens the core academic program</li> <li>• Increases the amount of learning time</li> <li>• Includes strategies for serving underserved populations - pg. 11</li> <li>• Includes strategies to address the needs of all children in the school, but particularly low achieving children <u>and those at risk of not meeting state standards</u></li> <li>• Address how the school will determine if those needs of the children have been met</li> <li>• Are consistent with and are designed to implement state and local improvement plans, if any</li> </ul>	Data Wise pgs. 11-16  pg. 7 - Impact pg. 13 - Review Quarterly Data Reading pg. 15 Review Quarterly Data Math pg. 23 - Improvement Plan
3. Highly qualified teachers in all core content area classes	pg. 35 HOUSSE
4. High qualified and ongoing professional development for teachers, principals, and paraprofessionals	pg. 6 - Technology pg. 16 Writing pg. 12 - Reading pg. 33 pg. 14 - Math
5. Strategies to attract high-quality, highly qualified teachers to this school	pg. 6 - PD Technology pgs. 12, 14, 16 PD pg. 23 Planning Time
6. Strategies to increase parent involvement, such as literacy services <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 6a. Description how the school will provide individual academic assessment results to parents</li> <li>• 6b. Strategies to involve parents in the planning, review and improvement of the schoolwide plan</li> </ul>	pg. 5 Parent Volunteer Program pg. 23 Plan Shared w/ Parents Training Opportunities pg. 5 - PTO

Schoolwide Component	Page(s) Found in SIP
7. Plans for assisting preschool children in the transition from early childhood programs such as Head Start, Even Start, Early Reading First, or a state-run preschool program	pg. 3 - PreK at JJ
8. Opportunities and expectations for teachers to be included in the decision making related to the use of academic assessment results leading to the improvement of student achievement	pg. 23 Comprehensive Needs Assessment pg. 3 Pacing Guides
9. Activities and programs at the school level to ensure that students having difficulty mastering proficient and advanced levels of the academic achievement are provided with effective, timely additional assistance	pg. 7 Impact
10. Coordination and integration of federal, state and local funds; and resources such as in-kind services and program components <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>10a. A list of programs that will be consolidated under the schoolwide plan (if applicable)</li> </ul>	pg 1 pg 27 CIS Blessings in a Backpack, 21 <sup>st</sup> Century CEEF-Charlestown Initiative



**IDOE School Improvement and Professional Development  
Building Level Assurance Form  
Principal / Exclusive Representative Signatures**

**Used Only When Exclusive Representative Signs Each School Individually.**

DOE Building Number	
Building Name	

As principal, I verify that the individual professional development plans for all schools within the corporation align with the overall corporation's objectives, goals and expectations. (IC 20-20-31-6)

Principal Name (Print)	
Principal's Signature	
Date Signed	

The exclusive representative is required to demonstrate support "only for the professional development program component of the plan."

By signing this form, I demonstrate my support for the professional development program for this school listed above as they have been reviewed, revised, and submitted as part of the Strategic and Continuous School Improvement and Achievement Plan. (511 IAC 6.2-3-3(10))

Exclusive Representative Name (Print)	
Exclusive Representative Signature	
Date Signed	

This signed form should be kept on file at the school's office.

Principals will electronically assure that this form is signed and on file at the school during the Legal Standard 1 School Improvement Plan Submission process.

**It is NOT necessary to return this form to the Indiana Department of Education.**