

**Department of Education**

333 Market Street
Harrisburg, PA 17126-0333

Getting Results Continuous Improvement Plan 2011-2012

Principal Name:	Mrs. Paula Daskivich
School Name:	INDIANA AREA SHS
District Name:	INDIANA AREA SD
School Number:	2325
AYP Status:	School Improvement I

School Improvement Team Members

Name	Role/Position
Paula Daskivich	Principal
Michael Bertig	Regular Education Teacher
Katie Smith	Guidance Counselor
Joy Dress	Regular Education Teacher
Cathy Schloemer	Regular Education Teacher
Bill Waryck	Regular Education Teacher
Julie Steve	Regular Education Teacher
Melissa Nibert	Regular Education Teacher
Kayla Stewart	Special Education Teacher
Donald Bowers	Special Education Teacher
John Uccellini	Math Coordinator
Joy Dress	Regular Education Teacher
Jill Earman	Curriculum Coordinator
Matt Scaife	Special Education Teacher
Maria Versace	LEP Teacher
Sarah Lonetti	Regular Education Teacher
Wade McElheny	Assistant Principal
Steve Cochran	Regular Education Teacher
Robert Rizzo	Regular Education Teacher

Review Data

This table contains the 2010 AYP data for the school. This data helps schools identify what must be addressed in the Action Sequences. This school **must** address any areas where they failed to meet the AYP targets or met the AYP targets by one of Pennsylvania's Special Provisions in the areas of Academic Performance, Participation, and Attendance/Graduation.

ACADEMIC PERFORMANCE	Did Not Make AYP	Made AYP By Special Provision	Made AYP
Reading	Econ Dis: 51.1%		Students Overall: 75.2% White: 75.5%
Math	Econ Dis: 28.9%		Students Overall: 58.7% White: 60%

OTHER TARGET AREAS	YES/NO
Test Participation	Target Met
Attendance/Graduation	Target Met

Analyze Effectiveness of 2009-10 Action Sequences

The following information documents the school's evaluation of the effectiveness of 2009-2010 Action Sequences.

2009-10 Reading Action Sequence

No data submitted in 2009-10.

2009-10 Math Action Sequence

No data submitted for 2009-10.

2009-10 Other Action Sequence

No data submitted for 2009-10.

Reading Data

The following table includes pre-populated AYP data, PSSA, achievement data and PVAAS growth data at the whole school, grade, and subgroup levels.

	DATA INQUIRY	DATA STATEMENT
Whole School		
R1	At least 63% of the "All Student Group" is advanced or proficient in READING. <i>Data source: (paayp.emetric.net)</i>	●The "All Student Group" exceeded the target by 12.2%.
R2	The "All Student Group" made AYP in READING with the help of a special provision. <i>Data source: (paayp.emetric.net)</i>	●The "All Student Group" met or exceeded the 63% target.
R3	The school made one year's growth in READING. <i>Data Source: (pvaas.sas.com) Grades 4-8 – School Value Added Report (2010 Mean NCE Gain over Grades relative to Growth Standard) Grade11 – School Value Added Report (2010 School Effect)</i>	●The "All Student Group" was significantly above the progress of the average school in the state.
R4	The school-wide trend for the "All Student Group" during the past 3 years reflects an increase each year in the percent of proficient or advanced students in READING. <i>Data source: (pssa.emetric.net) Getting Results Data Packet- Portrait of 3-Year Reading Results</i>	●From SY07-08 to SY08-09 the percentage went from 80% to 81.1%. From SY08-09 to SY09-10 the percentage went from 81.1% to 75.2%.
R5	The "All Student Group" met the AYP target for Participation in READING. <i>Data Source: (paayp.emetric.net)</i>	●The "All Student Group" met the 95% participation target.
Grade Level		
R6	Every grade in the school met or exceeded the NCLB READING target of 63% proficient or advanced. <i>Data Source: (pssa.emetric.net) Getting Results Data Packet- Portrait of 3-Year Reading Results</i>	All grades met or exceeded the target. ●Grade 11: 75.2%.
R7	Every grade in the school made one year's growth in READING. <i>Data Source: (pvaas.sas.com) Grades 4-8 – School Value Added Report (2010 Mean NCE Gain for each grade level) Grade11 – School Value Added Report (2010 School Effect)</i>	●Grade 11 was significantly above the progress of the average school in the state.
R8	Every grade that did NOT meet the proficiency target made one year's growth in READING. <i>Data Source: (pssa.emetric.net) and (pvaas.sas.com) Getting Results Data Packet- Portrait of 3-Year Reading Results & PVAAS School Value Added Reports</i>	●Not Applicable - All grades met or exceeded the target.
R9	Every predicted performance level group (below basic, basic, proficient, advanced) in each grade made one year's growth in READING. <i>Data Source: (pvaas.sas.com) PVAAS School Performance Diagnostic Summary Report (2010 Gain)</i>	●In Grade 11, these predicted proficiency groups made a year's growth: Basic, Proficient, Advanced. However, these predicted proficiency groups did NOT make one year's growth: Below Basic.
R10	Each tested grade has at least 72% (AYP target for SY 10-11) of the students in the 70% -100% probability range of reaching proficiency in READING at the next tested grade. <i>Data Source: (pvaas.sas.com) PVAAS School (Single Grade) Projection Summary Report</i>	●This statement cannot be pre-populated because there is no established pattern for sender/receiver schools.
R11	Every grade level trend for the past 3 years reflects an increase each year in the percent of proficient or advanced students in READING.	Not all grades show a positive three year trend. ●In Grade 11, from SY07-08 to SY08-09 the percentage went from 80% to 81.1%. From SY08-

	<i>Data source: (pssa.emetric.net) Getting Results Data Packet- Portrait of 3-Year Reading Results</i>	09 to SY09-10 the percentage went from 81.1% to 75.2%.
Subgroup Level		
R12	Every relevant subgroup (N ≥ 40) met or exceeded the NCLB READING target of 63% proficient or advanced. <i>Data Source: (paayp.emetric.net)</i>	Not every relevant subgroup met or exceeded the 63% target. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ●51.1% of the ED subgroup was proficient or advanced. ●75.5% of the White subgroup was proficient or advanced.
R13	Every relevant subgroup (N ≥ 40) met AYP in READING with the help of a special provision. <i>Data source: (paayp.emetric.net)</i>	●No relevant subgroup made AYP with the help of a special provision.
R14	Each relevant subgroup (N ≥ 40) closed the gap in proficiency between itself and the overall student group in READING. <i>Data source: (pssa.emetric.net) Getting Results Data Packet- Portrait of 3-Year Reading Results</i>	●The proficiency gap has increased between every relevant subgroup and the "All Student Group".
R15	The trend for the past 3 years for every relevant subgroup (N ≥ 40) reflects an increase each year in the percent of proficient or advanced students in READING. <i>Data source: (pssa.emetric.net) Getting Results Data Packet- Portrait of 3-Year Reading Results</i>	Not all relevant subgroups show a positive three year trend. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ●In SY07-08 to SY08-09 the percentage for the ED subgroup went from 58% to 56.6%. From SY08-09 to SY09-10 the percentage went from 56.6% to 51.1%. ●In SY07-08 to SY08-09 the percentage for the White subgroup went from 80.8% to 81%. From SY08-09 to SY09-10 the percentage went from 81% to 75.5%.
R16	Every relevant subgroup (N ≥ 40) met the AYP target for Participation in READING. <i>Data Source: (paayp.emetric.net)</i>	●Every relevant subgroup met the 95% participation target.

Locally Relevant Reading Data

The school has included the following data which provides additional information about student achievement in the area of reading:

Reading Assessment	Reading Data
NWEA (Northwest Evaluation Association) MAP (Measure of Academic Progress) Testing - October 2010	Based on October 2010 results from NWEA MAP testing (which projects proficiency on the PSSA): Seventy-seven percent of current eleventh graders are projected to be proficient or advanced on the PSSA Reading assessment this year. Seventy-two percent of current tenth graders are projected to be proficient or advanced on the PSSA Reading assessment when they reach eleventh grade. This percentage is based on current growth trends. This data shows that our general student population will likely meet AYP for this school year (2010-2011) and improve over the previous year. However, our current tenth graders will likely not reach the 81 percent AYP target for the next school year (2011-2012) without intervention.

Synthesize Reading Data

These are the strengths and concerns that have been identified from the analysis of reading achievement and growth data.

#	AREAS OF STRENGTH
1	We exceeded the AYP target for the "all student" group for the 2009-2010 school year by 12.2 percent.
2	Our top four quintiles for the "all student" group are making one year's growth overall.
3	Our overall progress in reading has been significantly above the Commonwealth average.

#	AREAS OF CONCERN
1	Our economically disadvantaged subgroup failed to meet the AYP target for the 2009-2010 school year by 11.9 percent.
2	The "below basic" group is not making one year's growth overall.
3	The "economically disadvantaged" subgroup has been declining over the past three school years: From 58 percent, to 56 percent, to 51.1 percent.
4	Since 2007, our "all student" AYP performance has declined from 80%. It is projected to be 72% for our current tenth graders next school year based on recent NWEA projections, which is a concern as the AYP target increases.

Math Data

The following table includes pre-populated AYP data, PSSA achievement data and PVAAS growth data at the whole school, grade, and subgroup levels.

	DATA INQUIRY	DATA STATEMENT
Whole School		
M1	At least 56% of the "All Student Group" is advanced or proficient in MATH. <i>Data source: (paayp.emetric.net)</i>	•The "All Student Group" exceeded the target by 2.7%.
M2	The "All Student Group" made AYP in MATH with the help of a special provision. <i>Data source: (paayp.emetric.net)</i>	•The "All Student Group" met or exceeded the 56% target.
M3	The school made one year's growth in MATH. <i>Data Source: (pvaas.sas.com) Grades 4-8 – School Value Added Report (2010 Mean NCE Gain over Grades relative to Growth Standard) Grade11 – School Value Added Report (2010 School Effect)</i>	•The "All Student Group" was significantly below the progress of the average school in the state.
M4	The school-wide trend for the "All Student Group" during the past 3 years reflects an increase each year in the percent of proficient or advanced students in MATH. <i>Data source: (pssa.emetric.net) Getting Results Data Packet- Portrait of 3-Year Math Results</i>	•From SY07-08 to SY08-09 the percentage went from 65.3% to 64.4%. From SY08-09 to SY09-10 the percentage went from 64.4% to 58.7%.
M5	The "All Student Group" met the AYP target for Participation in MATH. <i>Data Source: (paayp.emetric.net)</i>	•The "All Student Group" met the 95% participation target.
Grade Level		
M6	Every grade in the school met or exceeded the NCLB MATH target of 56% proficient or advanced. <i>Data Source: (pssa.emetric.net) Getting Results Data Packet- Portrait of 3-Year Math Results</i>	All grades met or exceeded the target. •Grade 11: 58.7%.
M7	Every grade in the school made one year's growth in MATH. <i>Data Source: (pvaas.sas.com) Grades 4-8 – School Value Added Report (2010 Mean NCE Gain for each grade level) Grade11 – School Value Added Report (2010 School Effect)</i>	•Grade 11 was significantly below the mean predicted score.
M8	Every grade that did NOT meet the proficiency target made one year's growth in MATH. <i>Data Source: (pssa.emetric.net) and (pvaas.sas.com) Getting Results Data Packet- Portrait of 3-Year Math Results & PVAAS School Value Added Reports</i>	•Not Applicable - All grades met or exceeded the target.
M9	Every predicted performance level group (below basic, basic, proficient, advanced) in each grade made one year's growth in MATH. <i>Data Source: (pvaas.sas.com) PVAAS School Performance Diagnostic Summary Report (2010 Gain)</i>	•In Grade 11, these predicted proficiency groups made a year's growth: Below Basic, Advanced. However, these predicted proficiency groups did NOT make one year's growth: Basic, Proficient.
M10	Each tested grade has at least 67% (AYP target for SY 10-11) of the students in the 70% -100% probability range of reaching proficiency in MATH at the next tested grade. <i>Data Source: (pvaas.sas.com) PVAAS School (Single Grade) Projection Summary Report</i>	•This statement cannot be pre-populated because there is no established pattern for sender/receiver schools.
	Every grade level trend for the past 3 years reflects an increase each year in the percent of proficient or	Not all grades show a positive three year trend. •In Grade 11, from SY07-08 to SY08-09 the

<p>M11</p>	<p>advanced students in MATH. <i>Data source: (pssa.emetric.net) Results Data Packet- Portrait of 3-Year Math Results</i></p>	<p>percentage went from 65.3% to 64.4%. From SY08-09 to SY09-10 the percentage went from 64.4% to 58.7%.</p>
<p>Subgroup Level</p>		
<p>M12</p>	<p>Every relevant subgroup (N ≥ 40) met or exceeded the NCLB MATH target of 56% proficient or advanced. <i>Data Source: (paayp.emetric.net)</i></p>	<p>Not every relevant subgroup met or exceeded the 56% target. ●28.9% of the ED subgroup was proficient or advanced. ●60% of the White subgroup was proficient or advanced.</p>
<p>M13</p>	<p>Every relevant subgroup (N ≥ 40) met AYP in MATH with the help of a special provision. <i>Data source: (paayp.emetric.net)</i></p>	<p>●No relevant subgroup made AYP with the help of a special provision.</p>
<p>M14</p>	<p>Each relevant subgroup (N ≥ 40) closed the gap in proficiency between itself and the overall student group in MATH. <i>Data source: (pssa.emetric.net) Getting Results Data Packet- Portrait of 3-Year Math Results</i></p>	<p>●The proficiency gap has increased between every relevant subgroup and the "All Student Group".</p>
<p>M15</p>	<p>The trend for the past 3 years for every relevant subgroup (N ≥ 40) reflects an increase each year in the percent of proficient or advanced students in MATH. <i>Data source: (pssa.emetric.net) Getting Results Data Packet- Portrait of 3-Year Math Results</i></p>	<p>Not all relevant subgroups show a positive three year trend. ●In SY07-08 to SY08-09 the percentage for the ED subgroup went from 40% to 39.6%. From SY08-09 to SY09-10 the percentage went from 39.6% to 28.9%. ●In SY07-08 to SY08-09 the percentage for the White subgroup went from 65.4% to 64.8%. From SY08-09 to SY09-10 the percentage went from 64.8% to 60%.</p>
<p>M16</p>	<p>Every relevant subgroup (N ≥ 40) met the AYP target for Participation in MATH. <i>Data Source: (paayp.emetric.net)</i></p>	<p>●Every relevant subgroup met the 95% participation target.</p>

Locally Relevant Math Data

The school has included the following data which provides additional information about student achievement in the area of math.

<p>Math Assessment</p>	<p>Math Data</p>
<p>NWEA (Northwest Evaluation Association) MAP (Measure of Academic Progress) Testing - October 2010</p>	<p>Based on October 2010 results from NWEA MAP testing (which projects proficiency on the PSSA): Fifty-nine percent of current eleventh graders are projected to be proficient or advanced on the PSSA Mathematics assessment this year. Sixty-five percent of current tenth graders are projected to be proficient or advanced on the PSSA Mathematics assessment when they reach eleventh grade. This percentage is based on current growth trends. This data shows that our general student population will likely not meet AYP for this school year (2010-2011) without intervention.</p>

Synthesize Math Data

#	AREAS OF STRENGTH
1	The "all student" group exceeded the AYP target for the 2009-2010 school year by 2.7 percent.
2	Our NWEA projections indicate a potential reversal in the observed downward trend in proficiency for the "all student" group.

#	AREAS OF CONCERN
1	Based on our NWEA projections, 38 percent of our economically disadvantaged eleventh graders will meet AYP this school year.
2	The "all student" group has declined in proficiency over the past three years, from 65.3, to 64.4, to 58.7 percent.
3	The lowest four quintiles from the 2009-2010 school year did not achieve one year of growth.
4	Economically disadvantaged students have declined in proficiency for the past three school years, from 42.3, to 39.6, to 28.9 percent.
5	While our NWEA projections show potential growth, the projected proficiency of 59 percent for current eleventh graders and 65 percent for current tenth graders will not meet the AYP targets.

Analyze Systems

The school analyzed their standards aligned systems by using the self-assessment criteria of the Foundational Guiding Questions.

	FOUNDATIONAL GUIDING QUESTIONS	No/Yes	Supporting Evidence
1	Is there strong, observable evidence that the standards-aligned curriculum and effective instructional practices are consistently implemented across all classrooms?	No	The mathematics and language arts curricula have not been revised to align with either the voluntary standards on SAS or the assessment anchors/eligible content for the PSSA. In addition, the instructional emphasis for specific content varies by instructor and is also dependent on the specific mathematics and language arts courses that each student takes.
2	Is there strong, observable evidence that school staff regularly uses standards-aligned assessments to monitor student achievement and adjust instructional practices?	No	Although NWEA testing is used as a diagnostic assessment to make data-informed decisions, only two half-days are scheduled each year to analyze this assessment data. Moreover, individual classroom assessments vary from teacher to teacher and are not consistently aligned with the voluntary standards on SAS or the assessment anchors/eligible content for the PSSAs.
3	Is there strong, observable evidence that struggling students are identified early and are supported by an intervention system with procedures for monitoring effectiveness?	No	Although struggling students are consistently identified through NWEA data, interventions are provided on a limited basis and are not sufficiently comprehensive at a schoolwide level.
4	Is there strong, observable evidence that <u>all</u> students have access to standards aligned curriculum and challenging assignments?	No	Students are currently tracked by ability level in both mathematics and English; as a result, students in lower tracks are not exposed to grade-level content/standards and challenging assignments. Specific analysis of student results on the Mathematics PSSA and specific math course content indicates that students who are not enrolled in our Functions, Statistics, and Trigonometry (FST) course by eleventh grade are not being exposed to all grade level content that is assessed on the PSSA exam and are therefore significantly less likely to reach proficiency.
5	Is there strong, observable evidence that student needs drive decisions about teacher assignments?	Yes	All of our teachers are highly qualified and meet certification requirements for the courses they teach. Moreover, instructional aides are assigned to provide additional support in classes with more significant numbers of special education students.
6	Is there strong, observable evidence that professional development is focused, strategic and implemented with fidelity?	Yes	Teachers identify their professional goals which are aligned to the school district's strategic plan. From there, administrators identify and provide corresponding professional development opportunities.
7	Is there strong, observable evidence that teachers and administrators meet regularly to reflect on the progress of students learning using multiple data sources and professional practice?	No	Although time has been provided periodically to review PSSA and NWEA data as it pertains to instructional practices and student learning, no daily or weekly coordinated common planning time is currently available for teachers who teach the same subject to meet with one another and administrators to reflect on the data and plan instruction accordingly.
8	Is there strong, observable evidence that teachers and administrators receive timely, effective support and intervention as needed?	Yes	An effective induction/mentoring program is provided to all new teachers. Also, after each observation, administrators provide teachers with a timely report that includes, if needed, specific areas for improvement. In that event, corresponding support and interventions are then provided.
9	Is there strong, observable evidence that each school's resources effectively address each school's instructional priorities?	Yes	While resources are limited by budgetary constraints, priority is given to allocating funds to meet instructional needs.
10	Is there strong, observable evidence that each school's administrative team leads the implementation of a standards-aligned system?	No	There is evidence (via Act 48 records) that the administrative team participates in the school-based professional development to determine the specific educator behaviors that will indicate the professional development is effective in changing practice. However, data to support that the administrative team holds all staff members accountable for consistent implementation of the standards-aligned curriculum is currently limited to classroom observations conducted for required evaluations and is therefore likely not sufficient to support this Foundational Guiding Question. In addition, as identified in #2 above, opportunities for teachers and administrators to analyze student achievement data at the building level are limited to two half-days each year - again, likely not sufficient to support this FGQ. Finally, as mentioned in #1 above, the current curricula are not aligned to voluntary standards/assessment anchors/eligible content.

<p>11</p>	<p>Is there strong, observable evidence that each member of the school community promotes, enhances and sustains a shared vision of positive school climate?</p>	<p>Yes</p>	<p>As evidenced by student/parent and faculty handbooks and teacher disciplinary referrals, school rules have been established with clear and consistent boundaries, and these rules are consistently enforced by all staff. In addition: 1) administrators actively seek input regarding school climate from student, staff and parents; 2) as evidenced by disciplinary records, the needs of students with chronic problem behaviors are promptly addressed; 3) as evidenced by administrative inspections, the school environment is clean and well maintained; and 4) as evidenced by assembly agendas and news releases, teachers and students are recognized for accomplishments.</p>
<p>12</p>	<p>Is there strong, observable evidence that school staff monitor attendance and student engagement and respond with classroom and school-wide interventions when students are chronically absent or disengaged?</p>	<p>Yes</p>	<p>The needs of disengaged students are first addressed by classroom teachers; an alternative education program is also available to meet the needs of students with more chronic concerns. In addition, guidance counselors, school nurses, and the district's full-time attendance officer monitor student attendance and contact parents of students who are chronically absent.</p>

Prioritize Concerns

In the table below, the school has identified and prioritized the systems concerns from their self-assessment using the Foundational Guiding Questions. For each prioritized concern listed, the school will develop an Action Sequence.

#	Systems Concerns
1	All students do not have access to a standards-aligned curriculum at the appropriate grade level. (FGQ #4)
2	Although struggling students are consistently identified through NWEA data, interventions are provided on a limited basis and are not sufficiently comprehensive on a schoolwide level. (FGQ #3)
3	The mathematics and language arts curriculum are not aligned with the voluntary standards on SAS or the assessment anchors/eligible content for the PSSAs. (FGQ #1)
4	The mathematics and language arts classroom assessments are not aligned with the voluntary standards in SAS and the assessment anchors/eligible content for the PSSAs. (FGQ#2)

Student Achievement Goals

The following table documents student achievement goals in Reading and Math established by the school for all relevant subgroups (N≥40) in all tested grades.

Reading: 2011 NCLB/AYP Target: 72%	
Student Group	Grade 11
Students Overall	77.00
White	80.00
Economically Disadvantaged	60.00

Math: 2011 NCLB/AYP Target: 67%	
Student Group	Grade 11
Students Overall	67.00
White	70.00
Economically Disadvantaged	40.00

Student Achievement Goals - Other

Reading Participation 2011 NCLB/AYP Target 95%	Minimum of 95%.
Math Participation 2011 NCLB/AYP Target 95%	Minimum of 95%.
ATTENDANCE (K-8 Only) 2011 NCLB/AYP Target 90% (or improvement from previous year's attendance)	
GRADUATION RATE (HS Only) 2011 NCLB/AYP Target 82.5% (or 10% reduction between 85% goal and the previous year's graduation rate)	Minimum of 82.5%.

Plan Solution

The Action Sequence below lays out the specific steps needed to implement research-based strategies and best practices designed to address the school's prioritized concerns.

Action Sequence 1

STEP 1: What is the problem?		STEP 2: What will you do?		STEP 3: Why are you doing it?	
Area of concern: Enter a High Priority Concern from the Foundational Guiding Questions		Research Based Strategies/Best Practices: Enter what will be done to address the concern		Reason: How will implementing this strategy address weaknesses in student achievement?	
The mathematics and language arts curriculum are not aligned with the voluntary standards on SAS or the assessment anchors/eligible content for the PSSAs. (FGQ #1)		Revise the curriculum for mathematics and language arts to align with the voluntary standards on SAS and the assessment anchors and eligible content for the PSSAs.		Implementing this strategy will ensure that course content aligns with the Commonwealth's assessment tools (i.e., the assessment anchors and eligible content for the PSSAs).	
Check the target area(s) that will be addressed by implementation of the research based strategy/best practice in Step 2:					
Performance: <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Reading <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Math		Participation: <input type="checkbox"/> Reading <input type="checkbox"/> Math		Other (please list):	
STEP 4: How will you get there?					
What Needs to Be Done: List the steps needed to implement this research based strategy/best practice		Who is responsible?		When will it be done?	What resources are needed?
1. Provide professional development opportunities for mathematics and language arts faculty in a standards-aligned system approach to supporting student achievement and developing a standards-aligned curriculum that incorporates the Understanding by Design framework.		District administrators, ARIN IU 28 staff		Spring 2011	www.pdesas.org, computers, in-service day
2. Revise the current curriculum cycle to provide an immediate focus on mathematics and language arts.		The district Coordinator of Curriculum and Instruction, the district Mathematics Coordinator		Spring 2011	N/A
3. Faculty members of the mathematics and language arts departments will meet and revise the appropriate curricula as needed.		The district Coordinator of Curriculum and Instruction, the district Mathematics Coordinator, regular and special education teachers specific to mathematics and language arts		Summer 2011 - Spring 2012	www.pdesas.org, including the mapping tool on the website, appropriate time and coverage
STEP 5: How will you know you are doing what you planned?			Step 6: What will you look for to determine if it is working?		
Indicators of Implementation: What the adults will be doing			Indicators of Effectiveness: Set measurable student achievement targets		
Sources of evidence will include copies of agendas and sign-in sheets for professional development activities; the revised curriculum cycle; copies of sign-in sheets for release days for curriculum revision; and the resulting revised mathematics and language arts curriculum aligned to the voluntary standards on SAS and the assessment anchors/eligible content for the PSSAs.			As evidenced by PSSA proficiency predictions from NWEA and actual PSSA results: 1) The "all student" population will at least meet the minimum AYP targets in mathematics and reading for the 2010-2011 and 2011-2012 school years. 2) The economically disadvantaged students will improve by approximately 10 percent in terms of proficiency for both the 2010-2011 and 2011-2012 school years.		

Action Sequence 2

STEP 1: What is the problem?	STEP 2: What will you do?	STEP 3: Why are you doing it?	
Area of concern: Enter a High Priority Concern from the Foundational Guiding Questions	Research Based Strategies/Best Practices: Enter what will be done to address the concern	Reason: How will implementing this strategy address weaknesses in student achievement?	
Although struggling students are consistently identified through NWEA data, interventions are provided on a limited basis and are not sufficiently comprehensive on a schoolwide level. (FGQ #3)	Develop a comprehensive diagnostic plan to identify struggling students. Intervention will then occur for those students using techniques such as differentiated instruction and the pdesas.org diagnostic tool as a means of addressing specific areas of deficit in mathematics and reading.	Identifying individual student needs and weaknesses and targeting those needs with interventions and differentiated instruction are strategies shown to increase student achievement.	
Check the target area(s) that will be addressed by implementation of the research based strategy/best practice in Step 2:			
Performance: <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Reading <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Math	Participation: <input type="checkbox"/> Reading <input type="checkbox"/> Math	Other (please list):	
STEP 4: How will you get there?			
What Needs to Be Done:	Who is responsible?	When will it be done?	What resources are needed?
List the steps needed to implement this research based strategy/best practice			
1. Provide professional development for all teachers to support the use of differentiated instructional strategies.	ARIN IU 28 staff	2010 - 2011 school year	Use of before/after school contractual time; release time provided by using substitutes for selected staff
2. Continue to identify projected non-proficient students in mathematics and reading using both the eighth grade PSSA and NWEA MAP test in grades nine through eleven.	The district Coordinator of Curriculum and Instruction, the district Mathematics Coordinator	Fall 2010, Fall 2011	Data analysis days, computers, NWEA tests, eMetrics website, time for teachers
3. Provide professional development for administrators and mathematics, English, and reading staff members on the classroom diagnostic tools available through the pdesas.org website.	ARIN IU 28 staff, identified in-house trainers	February 2011	Release time, computer access, pdesas.org website, workshop fees
4. Projected non-proficient students will complete a software-based diagnostic tool to identify specific reading deficits (i.e. A+ software, pdesas.org tools).	The Senior High School Principal, the Senior High School Assistant Principal, the special education teacher and reading teacher designated to administer diagnostic assessments	January 2011 - current eleventh graders, Spring 2011 - current tenth graders	Computer labs, release time for test administrators, A+ software, pdesas.org website
5. Utilize the classroom diagnostic tools available on the pdesas.org website to identify specific strength/weaknesses for students in mathematics and reading.	Mathematics, English, and reading teachers	Spring 2011 - Spring 2012	Computer labs, classroom time, pdesas.org website
6. Based on results of the software-based diagnostic tools, ensure students identified with specific reading deficits complete a series of differentiated modules to address individual needs using the A+ software.	English/reading teachers, the Senior High School Principal, the Senior High School Assistant Principal	January through April 2011 - current eleventh graders, 2011-2012 school year -current tenth graders	Computer labs, English lab, A+ software, flexibility in identified students' schedules
7. Based on the software-based diagnostic tools and previous PSSA results, provide students identified with specific mathematics deficits with differentiated support periods that address individual needs via the math lab or during other designated times (e.g., study halls, before/after school).	The district Mathematics Coordinator, the Senior High School Principal, the Senior High School Assistant Principal, mathematics teachers	2010 - 2011 school year and 2011-2012 school year	Flexibility in staff/student schedules
8. Implement a reading course for non-proficient ninth students; develop and implement intervention plans for identified	The district Coordinator of Curriculum and Instruction,	2011-2012	SRA Reading Program,

<p>tenth graders that addresses specific reading deficits; and expand the current Academic Support reading class for IEP students from two to five days per week.</p>	<p>the Senior High School Principal, reading teachers</p>	<p>school year</p>	<p>reading teachers, pdesas.org website</p>
<p>STEP 5: How will you know you are doing what you planned?</p>		<p>Step 6: What will you look for to determine if it is working?</p>	
<p>Indicators of Implementation: What the adults will be doing</p>	<p>Indicators of Effectiveness: Set measurable student achievement targets</p>		
<p>Sources of evidence will include copies of agendas and sign-in sheets for professional development activities; reports from software-based diagnostic tools and PSSAs that identify struggling students and their specific areas of need; and schedules/rosters of students receiving targeted interventions/supports; corresponding lesson plans/intervention plans; and overall documentation by AYP Coordinators designated to monitor all facets of implementation.</p>	<p>As evidenced by PSSA proficiency predictions from NWEA and actual PSSA results: 1) The "all student" population will at least meet the minimum AYP targets in mathematics and reading for the 2010-2011 and 2011-2012 school years. 2) The economically disadvantaged students will improve by approximately 10 percent in terms of proficiency for both the 2010-2011 and 2011-2012 school years. Also, using the NWEA normed testing data, identified students will demonstrate a minimum of one year's growth in mathematics and/or reading.</p>		

Action Sequence 3







STEP 1: What is the problem?	STEP 2: What will you do?	STEP 3: Why are you doing it?	
Area of concern: Enter a High Priority Concern from the Foundational Guiding Questions	Research Based Strategies/Best Practices: Enter what will be done to address the concern	Reason: How will implementing this strategy address weaknesses in student achievement?	
All students do not have access to a standards-aligned curriculum at the appropriate grade level. (FGQ #4)	Through the utilization of differentiated instruction and the changes in course offerings outlined below, all students will have access to a standards-aligned curriculum that is grade-appropriate.	The strategy will provide access for all students to a standards-aligned curriculum that is grade-appropriate.	
Check the target area(s) that will be addressed by implementation of the research based strategy/best practice in Step 2:			
Performance: <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Reading <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Math	Participation: <input type="checkbox"/> Reading <input type="checkbox"/> Math	Other (please list):	
STEP 4: How will you get there?			
What Needs to Be Done: List the steps needed to implement this research based strategy/best practice	Who is responsible?	When will it be done?	What resources are needed?
1. Eliminate the non-grade level track for mathematics (i.e., Integrated Math I and II)	The district Mathematics Coordinator, the Secondary High School Principal, the Secondary High School Assistant Principal, mathematics teachers	Elimination of Integrated Math I - 2010-2011 school year; elimination of Integrated Math II - 2011-2012 school year	N/A
2. Resequence geometry and advanced algebra courses for eleventh graders currently two years below grade level in mathematics and build-in support via team-teaching.	The district Mathematics Coordinator, the Secondary High School Principal, the Secondary High School Assistant Principal, mathematics teachers	2010-2011 school year, 2011-2012 school year	Revision of course offering sequence for mathematics courses; flexible teacher scheduling to provide team teaching, common planning time for team teachers
3. Provide professional development for all teachers to support the use of differentiated instructional strategies.	ARIN IU 28 staff	2010-2011 school year	Use of before/after school contractual time; release time provided by using substitutes for selected staff
4. Develop and present to the Board of School Directors a proposal for a free geometry course during the summer for students entering tenth grade who are one year below grade level, in order to close the achievement gap inherent with their current placement.	The Superintendent, the district Mathematics Coordinator, the Secondary High School Principal, the Secondary High School Assistant Principal, mathematics teachers, the IASD Board of School Directors	Summer 2011	Funding for summer course instructors
5. Compact the levels of English currently offered per grade level in order to ensure access for all students to a standards-aligned curriculum that is grade-appropriate.	The district Director of Curriculum and Instruction, the Secondary High School Principal, the Secondary High School Assistant Principal, English teachers	2011-2012 school year	Flexible scheduling for faculty/students, learning support staff
STEP 5: How will you know you are doing what you planned?		Step 6: What will you look for to determine if it is working?	
Indicators of Implementation: What the adults will be doing		Indicators of Effectiveness: Set measurable student achievement targets	
Sources of evidence include revised course offering lists, student schedules; teacher schedules verifying team-teaching; the resulting summer school proposal, and (if approved by the Board of School Directors) summer school rosters.		As evidenced by PSSA proficiency predictions from NWEA and actual PSSA results: 1) The "all student" population will at least meet the minimum AYP targets in mathematics and reading for the 2010-2011 and 2011-2012 school years. 2) The economically disadvantaged students will improve by approximately 10 percent in terms of proficiency for both the 2010-2011 and 2011-2012 school years.	

Action Sequence 4

STEP 1: What is the problem?	STEP 2: What will you do?		STEP 3: Why are you doing it?	
Area of concern: Enter a High Priority Concern from the Foundational Guiding Questions	Research Based Strategies/Best Practices: Enter what will be done to address the concern		Reason: How will implementing this strategy address weaknesses in student achievement?	
The mathematics and language arts classroom assessments are not aligned with the voluntary standards in SAS and the assessment anchors/eligible content for the PSSAs. (FGQ#2)	Evaluate current classroom assessments and revise as needed to ensure greater alignment with the voluntary standards in SAS and the assessment anchors/eligible content for the PSSAs.		Utilizing standards-aligned classroom assessments will both better prepare students for success on PSSAs, as well as help teachers identify areas of need for additional instruction/intervention.	
Check the target area(s) that will be addressed by implementation of the research based strategy/best practice in Step 2:				
Performance: <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Reading <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Math	Participation: <input type="checkbox"/> Reading <input type="checkbox"/> Math		Other (please list):	
STEP 4: How will you get there?				
What Needs to Be Done: List the steps needed to implement this research based strategy/best practice	Who is responsible?	When will it be done?	What resources are needed?	
1. Provide professional development the design of standards-aligned assessments, using the resources available on the pdesas.org website.	ARIN IU 28 staff, identified in-house trainers	Spring 2011-Fall 2011	Computers, designated professional development time, pdesas.org website	
2. Classroom teachers will evaluate and revise current assessment tools to align them to the voluntary standards in SAS and the assesement anchors/eligible content for the PSSAs.	Mathematics and English teachers	Spring 2011-Spring 2012	Release time, computers, pdesas.org website	
STEP 5: How will you know you are doing what you planned?		Step 6: What will you look for to determine if it is working?		
Indicators of Implementation: What the adults will be doing		Indicators of Effectiveness: Set measurable student achievement targets		
Sources of evidence will include professional development agendas and sign-in sheets, as well as the resulting classroom assessments aligned to the voluntary standards in SAS and the assessment anchors/eligible content for the PSSAs; overall documentation by AYP Coordinators designated to monitor all facets of implementation.		As evidenced by PSSA proficiency predictions from NWEA and actual PSSA results: 1) The "all student" population will at least meet the minimum AYP targets in mathematics and reading for the 2010-2011 and 2011-2012 school years. 2) The economically disadvantaged students will improve by approximately 10 percent in terms of proficiency for both the 2010-2011 and 2011-2012 school years.		

Professional Development

Listed below is the professional development needed to implement the action sequence.

Date/Time	Topic/Audience/Purpose	Alignment to Action Sequence				Facilitator/Provider	Anticipated changes in teacher practice that will be observed
2010-2011 School Year	1. Differentiated Instructional Strategies/all staff/Teacher use of differentiated instructional strategies	Action 1	Action 2 	Action 3 	Action 4	ARIN IU 28 staff	Teachers will use differentiated instructional strategies in their classrooms.
February 2011	2. Classroom Diagnostic Tools/Math, Reading, English departments/Implementation and interpretation of classroom diagnostic tools	Action 1	Action 2 	Action 3	Action 4	In-house facilitators trained by ARIN IU 28	Teachers will use classroom diagnostic tools to identify students' strengths and weaknesses and plan/modify instruction accordingly.
Spring 2011	3. Standards-Aligned System/Math and English teachers/Familiarize staff with the resources available on the pdesas.org website	Action 1 	Action 2	Action 3	Action 4	ARIN IU 28 staff and identified in-house trainers	Teachers will utilize the pdesas.org website.
Spring 2011	4. Understanding by Design Framework/Math, Reading, English departments/Understanding best practices in curriculum design	Action 1 	Action 2	Action 3	Action 4	The district Coordinator of Curriculum and Instruction, the district Mathematics Coordinator, ARIN IU 28 staff	Teachers will utilize the Understanding by Design Framework when revising mathematics and English/Language Arts curriculum
Fall 2011	5. Designing Standards-Aligned Assessments/Math, Reading, English departments/To align classroom assessment with the Standards-Aligned System	Action 1	Action 2	Action 3	Action 4 	ARIN IU 28 and identified in-house trainers	Teachers will administer classroom assessments that are aligned to standards/assessment anchors/eligible content.

Parental Involvement

Schools in improvement must address parental involvement in their plan in the following three areas:
(optional for Warning schools)

FAMILY/PRACTICE NOTIFICATION: Describe the processes used for notifying parents of the school's AYP status.	COMMUNICATION: Describe how school improvement efforts will be communicated to parents and the community.	FAMILY SUPPORT & PARTNERSHIPS: Describe strategies to engage parents in supporting teachers to educate their children.
Results were presented to the Indiana Area School District Board of Directors in a public meeting and published in the local newspaper and the school district website. The school report card is also available on the http://paayp.emetric.net website.	An overview of the School Improvement Plan will be presented to the Indiana Area School District Board of Directors and published on the school district website. Informational letters will be sent to parents of students targeted for intervention.	Such strategies as 9th and 10th grade orientation sessions, open houses, newsletters, parent-teacher conferences, and dissemination of information by guidance counselors are used to engage parents in supporting teachers to educate their children through parental encouragement/enforcement of their children in the following areas: Regular school attendance; homework completion; adequate preparation for various assessments; and scheduling of appropriate, rigorous courses.