



School Improvement Plan

Macatawa Bay Middle School

School Year: **2008-2009**
School District: **West Ottawa Public Schools**
School Name: **Macatawa Bay Middle School**
Grades Served: **6th → 8th**
Principal: **Michael Fine**

District Code: **70070**
Building Code: **06296**
Intermediate School District Code: **70**

School Vision Statement (Board Goals):

- Improve Student Achievement
- Implement strategic planning for programs and facilities
- Emphasize customer service and communications
- Support a safe and respectful environment

School Mission Statement: West Ottawa Public Schools, a caring community, challenging and inspiring students to learn and succeed in a diverse world.

School Belief Statements: As the heart of our community, West Ottawa Public Schools...

- Delivers quality and challenging programs
- Motivates students to succeed
- Honors diversity
- Inspires change
- Ensures a safe and secure environment

District Approval of Plan:

Authorized Official Signature and Date

Board of Education Approval of Plan:

Authorized Official Signature and Date

State of Michigan Macatawa Bay School Improvement Planning

| | |
|---|-------------------------------|
| School: Macatawa Bay Middle School | School Year: 2009-2010 |
|---|-------------------------------|

Section I: Comprehensive Analysis Report on Student Achievement

| | | | |
|------------------------------|--|--|--|
| Content Area: Reading | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Active Goal | <input type="checkbox"/> Maintenance Goal | <input type="checkbox"/> Revised Goal |
|------------------------------|--|--|--|

Student Goal Statement: All students will be proficient readers.

Statement of gap in student achievement (Need Statement):

Significant gaps (5% or greater) exist across grade levels between:

- Students with disabilities and students without disabilities
- Economically disadvantaged and non-economically disadvantaged
- ELL and non-ELL students
- Hispanic and Caucasian students
- Asian and Caucasian students

Item analysis of MEAP data for grades 7 and 8 reveal need for improvement in reading comprehension specifically,

- RCM.06.03 and RCM.07.03: Analyzing themes by drawing conclusions, making connections, making inferences, and synthesizing.

Contributing Cause for the gap in student achievement:

- Lack of intentional instruction of reading strategies.
- Limited use of reading data to inform instructional decisions and corresponding professional development.
- Limited use of research-based strategies to address the learning needs of a diverse demographic.
- Students with disabilities have received consistent access to the regular education curriculum for only 3 years.
- ESL curriculum is not aligned with Language Proficiency Standards and Grade Level Expectations.

List the multiple sources of data used to identify the gap in student achievement: MEAP and EXPLORE.

Section II: Comprehensive Analysis Report on System Processes and Practices

Listed below are the challenges from the Comprehensive Needs Assessment Strand reports, the EdYES! Report, the Standards Assessment Report or the Self Assessment Report that were aligned with this content area goal to be included in this School Improvement Plan. (These should be addressed as strategies/action steps in your SIP in Section III)

| Strand 1: Teaching for Learning | Strand 2: Leadership | Strand 3: Personnel & Professional Learning | Strand 4: School & Community Relations | Strand 5: Data & Info. Management |
|------------------------------------|--|---|--|-----------------------------------|
| | S2-Shared Leadership: Collaborative Inquiry | S2-Professional Learning: Results Driven | | |
| | | | | |

Section III: Plan to Accomplish Student Achievement Goals

Measurable Objective Statement to Support Goal: By the fall of 2011, at least 89% of students in each grade level will be proficient readers as measured by the MEAP, EXPLORE, and local reading assessment (yet to be determined). Additionally, each subgroup will score at least 89% proficient or increase the percentage of students who are proficient writers by 10% annually.

For this objective, list the multiple measure of assessments to be used that will provide authentic assessment of pupils' achievement, skills, and competencies: MEAP, EXPLORE, and a local reading assessment (yet to be determined).

Strategy Statement: Staff will meet in collaborative teams and consistently use demographic and achievement data to inform decisions

regarding implementation of best practices, instructional resources, and assessment tools for use in reading.

| Action Steps | Staff Responsible | Timeline for Activity | | Resources Needed | | | Monitoring Plan | Evidence of Success |
|--|--------------------------|-----------------------|-----------|-------------------------------|-----------|------------------------------|---|---|
| | | Begin | End | Resource | Source | Amount | | |
| Reading strategies through new resources (McDougal Littel) at middle school. | All ELA staff, Principal | Sept., 2008 | Ongoing | Book sets for teachers | Gen. Fund | No cost (purchased last yr.) | Administrator walk-throughs (observation) | Improved reading scores. |
| Implement identical assessments aligned to the grade level expectations, paying special attention to GLCE's RCM.06.03 and RCM.07.03. | All ELA staff | Sept. 2009 | Ongoing | Assessments | Gen. Fund | | Principal will review data from identical assessments. | Improvement in reading skills, especially analyzing themes by drawing conclusions, making connections, making inferences, and synthesizing. |
| Collaborative meetings/staff meetings will focus on data discussions around common assessments. | All ELA staff | Fall, 2009 | Ongoing | Building schedule of meetings | Gen. Fund | | SI Team and principal will review agendas / minutes. | Agendas and minutes will reflect content of best practices. |
| Identify a Common Reading Assessment. Need for systematic means of identifying and monitoring students progress in development of reading comprehension skills. | Teach and Learn Staff | Sept. 2008 | June 2009 | NA | NA | NA | Asst. Sup. Of T&L will monitor progress and maintain project information. | Implementation of assessment fall of 2009. |
| Soar to Success Reading | Principals, counselors, | Sept. 2007 | Ongoing | Soar to Success | Gen. Fund | No Annual | Student schedules | Soar to Success program |

| | | | | | | | | |
|---|---|--------------------------|-------------------|----------------------------------|------------------|-------------|---|--|
| intervention class @ middle school level | and all staff. | | | Program | | Cost | | assessment. Improved MEAP/EXPLORE reading scores. |
| Provide professional development for all teachers in reading across the content areas. | Department Heads and Principals | Sept., 2009 | May, 2009 | | Gen. Fund | | SI Team and principal will review agendas/minutes. | Agendas / minutes will reflect content of reading strategies. |
| Content area teachers will integrate reading strategies in daily lessons. | All staff | Fall 2009 | May, 2009 | | | | Principals will look for reading strategies during classroom walk-throughs | Principals observe effective implementation of reading strategies. Improvement of reading scores as measured by MEAP and local reading assessments. |
| Send one teacher from each core department to Doug Fisher's workshop "In a Reading State of Mind". | 4 core teachers and principal | April 22, 2009 | June, 2009 | Meeting | Gen. Fund | | Core teachers will make a presentation to the rest of the staff. | Completion of presentation. |
| Students with disabilities will continue to receive consistent access to the regular education curriculum. | Special Education Staff, Principal | 06-07 school year | Ongoing | Regular Education Curric. | Gen. Fund | | Classroom walkthroughs. Special ed. staff attendance at department meetings. | Increase in student achievement of students with disabilities |

| | | | | | | | | |
|--|---|-------------------|------------------|---|------------------|--|--|--|
| | | | | | | | | |
| Align ELL curriculum with Language Proficiency Standards and ELA Grade Level Expectations | ELL staff, Principal, ELL Director, Asst. Sup. For Teach And Learn | Fall, 2009 | May, 2009 | Release time to Complete Curric. Work. | Gen. Fund | | Principal will review some curric. Dev. Mtgs. Asst. Sup, ELL Director and Principal will review completed curriculum. | Completion of aligned curriculum. |
| | | | | | | | | |

Other Required Information

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

- McDougal Little: Research based program for developing reading skills.
- In a Reading State of Mind: Brain Research, Teacher Modeling & Comprehension Instruction by Doug Fisher, Nancy Frey and Diane Lapp.
- Soar to Success: Program research conducted by Houghton Mifflin.
- Common Reading Assessment: We are reviewing research for various assessments. This will be a major factor in selecting an appropriate assessment for use in the district.
- Marzano's research on the positive impact of aligned curriculum.
- DuFour, DuFour, and Eaker's research on the positive impact of professional learning communities.

What Professional Learning activities will you need to provide to support the successful implementation of this strategy/action?

- Data Director
- Data discussions: How to use data to inform instruction.
- Reading in the Content Areas
- Curriculum writing for the ELL staff.

How has the school integrated its available fiscal resources to support this strategy and action steps? Using a combination of grant funds and general funds to support these initiatives.

How has the school assessed the need for, and integrated the use of, telecommunications and informational technology to support this strategy and action steps? District has purchased Data Director to provide data warehousing capabilities to support these activities.

State of Michigan

Macatawa Bay School Improvement Planning

| | | | | |
|---|--|--|---|--|
| School: Macatawa Bay Middle School | | School Year: 2009-2010 | | |
| Section I: Comprehensive Analysis Report on Student Achievement | | | | |
| Content Area: Writing | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Active Goal | <input type="checkbox"/> Maintenance Goal | <input type="checkbox"/> Revised Goal | |
| Student Goal Statement: All students will be proficient writers. | | | | |
| <p>Statement of Gap in Student Achievement (Need Statement): Significant gaps (5% or greater) exist across grade levels between:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • students with disabilities and students without disabilities; • economically disadvantaged and non-economically disadvantaged; • ELL and non-ELL students; • Hispanic and Caucasian students; and • male and female students. <p>Percent of students receiving comment, "Needs details and examples to adequately develop the ideas and content," on MEAP assessment is significantly high:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Grade 7: Fall 2006 = 54% Fall 2007 = 62% Fall 2008 = 56% • Grade 8: Fall 2006 = 69% Fall 2007 = 54% Fall 2008 = 54% | | | | |
| <p>Contributing Cause for the Gap in Student Achievement:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Use of demographic data to inform decisions regarding program development and implementation, and corresponding professional development is limited. • Use of research-based strategies to address the learning needs of a diverse demographic is limited. • Students with disabilities have received consistent access to the regular education curriculum for only 3 years. • ESL curriculum is not aligned with the Language Proficiency Standards and ELA Grade Level Expectations. | | | | |
| List the multiple sources of data used to identify the gap in student achievement: MEAP and EXPLORE. | | | | |
| Section II: Comprehensive Analysis Report on System Processes and Practices | | | | |
| <p>Listed below are the challenges from the Comprehensive Needs Assessment Strand reports, the EdYES! Report, the Standards Assessment Report or the Self Assessment Report that were aligned with this content area goal to be included in this School Improvement Plan. (These should be addressed as strategies/action steps in your SIP in Section III.)</p> | | | | |
| Strand 1: Teaching for Learning | Strand 2: Leadership | Strand 3: Personnel & Professional Learning | Strand 4: School & Community Relations | Strand 5: Data & Info. Management |
| | | S2-Professional Learning: Results Driven | | |
| | | | | |
| Section III: Plan to Accomplish Student Achievement Goals | | | | |
| <p>Measurable Objective Statement to Support Goal: By the fall of 2011, at least 89% of students in each grade level will be proficient writers as measured by the MEAP, EXPLORE, and District Writing Prompts (3 times per year). Additionally, each subgroup will score at least 89% proficient or increase the percentage of students who are proficient writers by 10% annually.</p> | | | | |

For this objective, list the multiple measure of assessments to be used that will provide authentic assessment of pupils' achievement, skills, and competencies: MEAP, EXPLORE (English subtest), and District Writing Prompts

Strategy Statement: Staff will meet in collaborative teams and consistently use demographic and achievement data to inform decisions regarding implementation of best practices, instructional resources, and assessment tools for use in writing.

| Action Steps | Staff Responsible | Timeline for Activity | | Resources Needed | | | Monitoring Plan | Evidence of Success |
|---|--------------------------|-----------------------|---------|---|-----------------|---------------------------|---|---|
| | | Begin | End | Resource | Source | Amount | | |
| Writing process implemented via new resources (McDougal Littel) at Middle School. | All ELA Staff, Principal | Sept., '08 | Ongoing | Book Sets for Teachers | General Fund | No Cost (purch. last yr.) | Administrator will conduct walk-throughs (observation). | Improved Writing Scores |
| ELA teachers will assess student writing using Six Traits rubrics, paying special attention to the inclusion of details and examples. | All ELA Staff | April, '09 | Ongoing | Textbooks and Materials | McDougal Littel | No Cost (purch. last yr.) | ELA teachers will turn in graded writing assignments to principal for review. | Improvement in writing scores will be evident, especially providing details and examples. |
| Collaborative meetings will focus on data discussions around common assessments, paying special attention to the inclusion of details and examples. | All ELA Staff | Fall, '09 | Ongoing | Building Schedule of Meetings | General Fund | | SI Team and Principal will review agendas/minutes. | Agendas and minutes will reflect data analysis and best practices. Improvement in writing scores will be evident, especially providing details and examples. |
| Identical MEAP-like writing prompts will be implemented 3 times per year. Language arts teachers will | All ELA Staff | April, '09 | Ongoing | Schedule of Writing Prompt Implement Windows Release | General Fund | | Observations of meetings by principal and depart. chair SI team, | Improvement in scores on the writing prompts will be clear. Disaggregation |

| | | | | | | | | |
|---|--------------------------|--------------------------------|-----------|--|--------------------------|--|---|---|
| collaboratively score the students' writings, paying special attention to the inclusion of details and examples. | | | | time will be provided for teachers to collaboratively score student writing. | | | depart. chair, and principal will review data from student writing. | of writing scores will show lessening of gaps between groups of students cited in Statement of Gap above. |
| Returned student MEAP writings will be used to rewrite for improvement, paying special attention to the inclusion of details and examples. | All ELA Staff | Upon Receipt of Released Items | Sept, '09 | Released Student Writings | MEAP | N/A | | Improvement in writing scores will be evident, especially providing details and examples. |
| District writing prompts will be used to rewrite for improvement, paying special attention to the inclusion of details and examples. | All ELA Staff | Ongoing | Ongoing | Student Work from District Writing Prompts | District Writing Prompts | N/A | | Improvement in writing scores will be evident, especially providing details and examples. |
| Content area teachers will implement a minimum of 6 Type 3 writings per year, incorporating the use of details and examples as one of the FCA's for each of these writings. | All staff | Fall, '09 | Ongoing | Collins Writing Materials | John Collins | No Cost (purch. a couple of years ago) | Teachers will turn in all graded student writing samples to a principal for review. | |
| Range Finding with Content Area Teachers (professional development activity) | Members of ELA Staff | Spring, '09 | Fall, '09 | Staff Meeting | General Fund | | Observation of meeting by all depart. chairs and principals | Teacher Surveys |
| Students with disabilities will continue to receive | Special Education Staff, | '06-'07 School Year | Ongoing | Regular Education Curriculum | General Fund | | Administrator will conduct walk-throughs | Student achievement of students with |

| | | | | | | | | |
|--|--|-----------|----------|--|--------------|--|---|----------------------------------|
| consistent access to the regular education curriculum. | Principal | | | | | | (observation). Special ed. staff will attend at department meetings. | disabilities will increase. |
| ELL curriculum will be aligned with Language Proficiency Standards and ELA Grade Level Expectations. | ELL Staff, Principal, ELL Dir., Asst. Sup. for Teaching and Learning | Fall, '09 | May, '09 | Release time will be provided to complete curriculum work. | General Fund | | Principal will attend some curriculum development meetings. Principal will review completed curriculum. | Completion of Aligned Curriculum |

Other Required Information

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

- Professional Learning Communities at Work by DuFour and Eaker
- 6+1 Traits of Writing by Culham
- Developing Writing and Thinking Skills Across the Curriculum: A Practical Program for Schools by John J. Collins

What Professional Learning activities will you need to provide to support the successful implementation of this strategy/action?

Data Discussions, Data Director, Writing techniques/strategies, scoring, and using data to inform instruction with Kathy Gilbert, Range Finding for all teachers focusing on details and examples.

How has the school integrated its available fiscal resources to support this strategy and action steps? A combination of grant funds and general funds have been, currently are, and will be used to support these initiatives.

How has the school assessed the need for, and integrated the use of, telecommunications and informational technology to support this strategy and action steps? All teachers will be trained in the use of Data Director.

State of Michigan

Macatawa Bay School Improvement Planning

School: Macatawa Bay Middle School

School Year: 2009-2010

Section I: Comprehensive Analysis Report on Student Achievement

Content Area: Math

(X) Active Goal

() Maintenance Goal

() Revised Goal

Student Goal Statement: All Macatawa Bay students will be proficient in Math.

Statement of gap in student achievement: From the year 2006-2008, 7th grade students have increased in overall performance by 19 percentage points and 8th grade students have increased by 5 percentage points.

7th Grade Fall 2006 = 71% Fall 2007 = 80% Fall 2008 = 89%

Seventh grade sub group MEAP analysis showed the following from Fall 2006 → Fall 2008 as compared within each subgroup:

| | |
|----------------------------|--------------------------------------|
| Economically Disadvantaged | (Base is 06 = 59%, 07 = 68, 08 = 80) |
| Asian/Pacific Islander | (Base is 06 = 65%, 07 = 83, 08 = 86) |
| Hispanic | (Base is 06 = 49%, 07 = 68, 08 = 80) |
| White | (Base is 06 = 83%, 07 = 90, 08 = 93) |
| Multiracial | (Base is 06 = 83%, 07 = 67, 08 = 86) |
| Students w/disabilities | (Base is 06 = 26%, 07 = 45, 08 = 61) |
| Students w/o disabilities | (Base is 06 = 77%, 07 = 89, 08 = 92) |
| ELL | (Base is 06 = 55%, 07 = 40, 08 = 75) |
| Male | (Base is 06 = 67%, 07 = 77, 08 = 87) |
| Female | (Base is 06 = 75%, 07 = 84, 08 = 90) |

8th Grade Fall 2006 = 81% Fall 2007 = 82% Fall 2008 = 86%

Eighth grade sub group MEAP analysis showed the following from Fall 2006 → Fall 2008 as compared within each subgroup:

| | |
|----------------------------|---------------------------------------|
| Economically Disadvantaged | (Base is 06 = 71%, 07 = 73, 08 = 83) |
| Asian/Pacific Islander | (Base is 06 = 79%, 07 = 85, 08 = 100) |
| Hispanic | (Base is 06 = 66%, 07 = 62, 08 = 77) |
| White | (Base is 06 = 90%, 07 = 94, 08 = 91) |
| Multiracial | (Base is 06 = 73%, 07 = 83, 08 = 69) |
| Students w/disabilities | (Base is 06 = 42%, 07 = 52, 08 = 55) |
| Students w/o disabilities | (Base is 06 = 86%, 07 = 86, 08 = 90) |
| ELL | (Base is 06 = 40%, 07 = 41, 08 = 79) |
| Male | (Base is 06 = 79%, 07 = 82, 08 = 83) |
| Female | (Base is 06 = 81%, 07 = 82, 08 = 86) |

Seventh Grade MEAP**Students with Disabilities**

| | |
|-----------|-----|
| Fall 2006 | 26% |
| Fall 2007 | 45% |
| Fall 2008 | 61% |

Students without Disabilities

| |
|-----|
| 86% |
| 86% |
| 92% |

Economically Disadvantaged

| | |
|-----------|-----|
| Fall 2006 | 59% |
| Fall 2007 | 68% |
| Fall 2008 | 80% |

Non-Economically Disadvantaged

| |
|-----|
| 79% |
| 88% |
| 95% |

ELL

| | |
|-----------|-----|
| Fall 2006 | 55% |
| Fall 2007 | 40% |
| Fall 2008 | 75% |

Non-ELL

| |
|-----|
| 76% |
| 85% |
| 88% |

Hispanic

| | |
|-----------|-----|
| Fall 2006 | 49% |
| Fall 2007 | 68% |
| Fall 2008 | 80% |

Caucasian

| |
|-----|
| 83% |
| 90% |
| 93% |

Asian-Pacific Islander

| | |
|-----------|-----|
| Fall 2006 | 65% |
| Fall 2007 | 83% |
| Fall 2008 | 86% |

Caucasian

| |
|-----|
| 83% |
| 90% |
| 93% |

Multi-Racial

| | |
|-----------|-----|
| Fall 2006 | 83% |
| Fall 2007 | 67% |
| Fall 2008 | 86% |

Caucasian

| |
|-----|
| 83% |
| 90% |
| 93% |

Eighth Grade MEAP**Students with Disabilities**

| | |
|-----------|-----|
| Fall 2006 | 42% |
| Fall 2007 | 52% |
| Fall 2008 | 55% |

Students without Disabilities

| |
|-----|
| 86% |
| 86% |
| 90% |

Economically Disadvantaged

| | |
|-----------|-----|
| Fall 2006 | 71% |
| Fall 2007 | 73% |
| Fall 2008 | 76% |

Non-Economically Disadvantaged

| |
|-----|
| 87% |
| 88% |
| 89% |

| | | | |
|-------------------------------|------|------------------|-----|
| <u>ELL</u> | | <u>Non-ELL</u> | |
| Fall 2006 | 40% | | 83% |
| Fall 2007 | 41% | | 85% |
| Fall 2008 | 79% | | 88% |
| <u>Hispanic</u> | | <u>Caucasian</u> | |
| Fall 2006 | 66% | | 90% |
| Fall 2007 | 62% | | 95% |
| Fall 2008 | 77% | | 91% |
| <u>Asian-Pacific Islander</u> | | <u>Caucasian</u> | |
| Fall 2006 | 79% | | 90% |
| Fall 2007 | 85% | | 94% |
| Fall 2008 | 100% | | 91% |
| <u>Multi-Racial</u> | | <u>Caucasian</u> | |
| Fall 2006 | 73% | | 90% |
| Fall 2007 | 83% | | 94% |
| Fall 2008 | 69% | | 91% |

There are significant gaps (5% or greater) existing across grade levels between:

- **Students with disabilities and students without disabilities**
- **Economically disadvantaged and non-economically disadvantaged**
- **ELL and non-ELL students**
- **Hispanic and Caucasian students**

Contributing Cause for the gap in student achievement:

- **Limited use of demographic data to inform decisions regarding program development and implementation, and corresponding professional development.**
- **Limited use of research-based strategies to address the learning needs of a diverse demographic.**
- **Students with disabilities have not had consistent access to the regular curriculum.**

List the multiple sources of data used to identify the gap in student achievement: MEAP, EXPLORE, Common Assessments

Section II: Comprehensive Analysis Report on System Processes and Practices

Listed below are the challenges from the Comprehensive Needs Assessment Strand reports, the EdYES! Report, the Standards Assessment Report or the Self Assessment Report that were aligned with this content area goal to be included in this School Improvement Plan. (These should be addressed as strategies/action steps in your SIP in Section III)

| Strand1: Teaching for Learning | Strand 2: Leadership | Strand 3: Personnel & Professional Learning | Strand 4: School & Community Relations | Strand 5: Data & Info. Management |
|---|--|--|---|--|
| | S2 – Shared Leadership: Collaborative Inquiry | S2-Professioanl Learning: Results Driven | | |

Section III: Plan to Accomplish Student Achievement Goals

Measurable Objective Statement to support Goal: By the end of the 2011-2012 school year, at least 90% of students at each grade level will be proficient in math as measured by the MEAP test, grade level common assessments and the EXPLORE test. Additionally, each subgroup falling below 90% will increase the percent of students that are proficient in math by 10% annually.

For this objective, list the multiple measure of assessments to be used that will provide authentic assessment of pupils' achievement, skills, and competencies: MEAP, EXPLORE, Common Assessments

Strategy Statement: Staff will meet in collaborative teams and consistently use demographic and achievement data to inform decisions regarding implementation of best practices, instructional resources, and assessment tools.

| Action Steps | Staff Responsible | Timeline for Activity | | Resources Needed | | | Monitoring Plan | Evidence of Success |
|--|----------------------------|-----------------------|-----------|------------------|--------|--------|--|--|
| | | Begin | End | Resource | Source | Amount | | |
| Doug Fisher book study 4 times during the year to develop and then implement strategies for vocabulary development | All Math | Fall 2009 | June 2010 | Doug Fisher Book | | | Review of Lesson Plans Book Study minutes | Lesson Plan and Meeting minutes will reflect vocabulary development strategies |
| Begin benchmarking at 8 th Grade | 8 th Grade Math | Fall 2009 | Ongoing | | | | Review of Lesson Plans/Curriculum Maps Meeting Agenda and Minutes | Completed Curriculum Map Assessment Data |
| Continue implementation of benchmarking at the 7 th grade | 7 th Grade Math | Fall 2008 | Ongoing | | | | Review of Lesson Plans/Curriculum Maps Meeting Agenda and Minutes | Completed Curriculum Map Assessment Data |
| Continue implementation of benchmarking at the 6 th grade | 6 th Grade Math | Fall 2007 | Ongoing | | | | Review of Lesson Plans/Curriculum Maps Meeting Agenda and Minutes | Completed Curriculum Map Assessment Data |
| Collaborative meetings will focus on data to | All Math | Fall 2007 | Ongoing | | | | Intervention Sign-in | Improvement in achievement for those students who received |

| | | | | | | | | |
|---|---|-----------|---------|--|--|--|--|---------------------|
| adjust instruction and identify students who need intervention | | | | | | | | Intervention |
| Creating and implementing a comprehensive end-of-year exam for all grade levels to inform instruction and identify students for additional intervention | All Math | May 2009 | | | | | | |
| Continue to give Special Education students access to the General Education Curriculum and hold collaborative meetings between the Special Education Math Staff and the General Ed. Math Teachers | All General Ed and Special Ed Math Teachers | Fall 2009 | Ongoing | | | | | |

Other Required Information

What research did you review to support the use of this strategy and action plan? Professional Learning Communities at Work by DuFour and Eaker, Doug Fisher, SIOP

What Professional Learning activities will you need to provide to support the successful implementation of this strategy/action? Data Director, Effective strategies for Vocabulary development, Professional Learning Communities, Reading Instruction Strategies

How has the school integrated its available fiscal resources to support this strategy and action steps?

State of Michigan

Macatawa Bay School Improvement Planning

School: Macatawa Bay Middle School

School Year: 2008-2009

Section I: Comprehensive Analysis Report on Student Achievement

Content Area: Science

(X) Active Goal

() Maintenance Goal

() Revised Goal

Student Goal Statement: All Macatawa Bay Middle School students will be proficient in Science.

Statement of gap in student achievement:

Overall School Science Performance

Over the last three years (Fall 2006-Fall 2008), the percentage of students scoring proficient on the MEAP has stayed relatively the same with a slight decrease in the last year: **Fall 2006 = 86%** **Fall 2007 = 86%** **Fall 2008 = 84%**

Sub group MEAP analysis showed the following from Fall 2006 → Fall 2008 as compared within each subgroup:

| | | |
|----------------------------|----------|---|
| Economically Disadvantaged | Slight | ↑ in performance (Base is 06 = 74%, 07 = 77, 08 = 76) |
| Asian/Pacific Islander | Slight | ↑ in performance (Base is 06 = 79%, 07 = 80, 08 = 87) |
| Hispanic | Slight | ↑ in performance (Base is 06 = 70%, 07 = 73, 08 = 74) |
| White | Slight | ↓ in performance (Base is 06 = 94%, 07 = 95, 08 = 90) |
| Multiracial | Moderate | ↓ in performance (Base is 06 = 91%, 07 = 92, 08 = 75) |
| Students w/disabilities | Slight | ↓ in performance (Base is 06 = 54%, 07 = 68, 08 = 48) |
| Students w/o disabilities | Slight | ↓ in performance (Base is 06 = 90%, 07 = 88, 08 = 89) |
| ELL | High | ↑ in performance (Base is 06 = 40%, 07 = 59, 08 = 67) |
| Male | Slight | ↓ in performance (Base is 06 = 84%, 07 = 88, 08 = 81) |
| Female | Slight | ↓ in performance (Base is 06 = 88%, 07 = 84, 08 = 87) |

Slight Range = 0% → 5%

Moderate Range = 6% → 10%

High Range = ≤10%

Sub-group data shows no subgroup has decreased by a margin greater than 5%, with the exception of Multiracial, compared within the same subgroup as shown above.

Significant gaps (5% or greater) exist in Grade 8 for the last 3 years as shown below:

- Students with Disabilities and Students without Disabilities
- Economically Disadvantaged and Non-economically Disadvantaged
- English Language Learners and Non-English Language Learners
- Hispanic and Caucasian
- Asian/Pacific Islander and Caucasian (2 of 3 years only)
- Multiracial and Caucasian (1 of 3 years only)

| | <u>Students with Disabilities</u> | <u>Students without Disabilities</u> |
|-----------|-----------------------------------|---------------------------------------|
| Fall 2006 | 54% | 90% |
| Fall 2007 | 68% | 88% |
| Fall 2008 | 48% | 89% |
| | <u>Economically Disadvantaged</u> | <u>Non-Economically Disadvantaged</u> |
| Fall 2006 | 74% | 92% |
| Fall 2007 | 77% | 92% |
| Fall 2008 | 76% | 90% |
| | <u>ELL</u> | <u>Non-ELL</u> |
| Fall 2006 | 40% | 88% |
| Fall 2007 | 59% | 88% |
| Fall 2008 | 67% | 88% |
| | <u>African-American</u> | <u>Caucasian</u> |
| Fall 2006 | < | 94% |
| Fall 2007 | < | 95% |
| Fall 2008 | < | 90% |
| | <u>Hispanic</u> | <u>Caucasian</u> |
| Fall 2006 | 70% | 94% |
| Fall 2007 | 73% | 95% |
| Fall 2008 | 74% | 90% |
| | <u>Asian-Pacific Islander</u> | <u>Caucasian</u> |
| Fall 2006 | 79% | 94% |
| Fall 2007 | 80% | 95% |
| Fall 2008 | 87% | 90% |
| | <u>Multi-Racial</u> | <u>Caucasian</u> |
| Fall 2006 | 91% | 94% |
| Fall 2007 | 92% | 95% |
| Fall 2008 | 75% | 90% |

Contributing Cause for the Gap in Student Achievement:

- Limited use of district demographic data to inform decisions regarding program development and implementation, and corresponding professional development.
- Limited use of research-based strategies to address the learning needs of diverse demographic
- Special Education students receive more targeted support in their disability area(s) of ELA and Math
- Science curriculum is undergoing realignment to meet the new GLCE alignment structure for fall 2010. The current curriculum had parts based on the state Grade Level Content Expectations (GLCE'S) and the most recent MEAP was based on the old state benchmarks.
- Language barrier still exists however it has improved dramatically over the past two years.

- Student difficulty understanding graph interpretation and/or analysis of graphs and tables based on review of MEAP and ACT/Explore data.
- The underlying GLCE's of the Metric System (Measurement/Units) and Conducting Investigations could be linked to performance drops in other strands
Data shows the following decrease in the Construct Scientific Knowledge Strand over three years → 08-09 (60%), 07-08 (61%), 06-07 (62%)

List the multiple sources of data used to identify the gap in student achievement:

- MEAP
- Common Assessments
- ACT Explore (Science Section)

Section II: Comprehensive Analysis Report on System Processes and Practices

Listed below are the challenges from the Comprehensive Needs Assessment Strand reports, the EdYES! Report, the Standards Assessment Report or the Self Assessment Report that were aligned with this content area goal to be included in this School Improvement Plan. (These should be addressed as strategies/action steps in your SIP in Section III)

| Strand 1: Teaching for Learning | Strand 2: Leadership | Strand 3: Personnel & Professional Learning | Strand 4: School & Community Relations | Strand 5: Data & Info. Management |
|---------------------------------|--|---|--|-----------------------------------|
| | S2-Shared Leadership: Collaborative Decision Making Process | S2-Professional Learning: Results Driven | S1-Parent/Family Involvement: Decision Making | |
| | | | | |

Section III: Plan to Accomplish Student Achievement Goals

Measurable Objective Statement to support Goal:

S.M.A.R.T. Goal: By the year 2012, 92% of 6th - 8th grade students will be proficient in Science, as measured by the MEAP, Science Common Assessments and ACT Explore. Yearly targets identified: Year #1 (2010) = 88% Year #2 (2011) = 90% Year #3 (2012) = 92%

For this objective, list the multiple measure of assessments to be used that will provide authentic assessment of pupils' achievement, skills, and competencies:

- MEAP
- ACT Explore
- Common Assessments (when fully developed)

Strategy Statement:

Staff will collaboratively develop data-driven curriculums. Demographic and achievement data will be used to inform decisions regarding the implementation of best practices, instructional resources, and assessment tools in the delivery of the curriculum.

| Action Steps | Staff Responsible | Timeline for Activity | | Resources Needed | | | Monitoring Plan | Evidence of Success |
|--|-------------------|-----------------------|----------|------------------|---------|---------|-----------------|----------------------|
| | | Begin | End | Resource | Source | Amount | | |
| Graph Design/ Interpretation focus on Synthesizing Information | All Staff | May 2009 | On-going | Dept/PD time | No cost | No cost | Dept. Minutes | Improved MEAP Scores |

| | | | | | | | | |
|---|---|-----------------|-------------|-------------------------------|-------------------------------|----------------|---|--|
| Purchase new Science Curriculum | Reps from each Grade Level for review | 08-09 | Fall 2010 | Release and work session time | Gen. fund | | Committee will submit rec. to Office of Teaching and Learning | Implementation of new aligned curriculum Fall 2010 |
| Curriculum aligned to adopted GLCE's by Fall 2010 | All Staff | On-going | Fall 2010 | Dept/PD Time | No cost | No Cost | Dept/PD Minutes | Revised Curriculum Maps |
| Structured review by 8 th grade teachers prior to MEAP assessment Focus is on selected GLCE's as supported by MEAP data. | All Staff | 08-09 | Spring 2009 | Dept/PD Time | No Cost | No Cost | Update review materials following data analysis | Review Packets |
| End of 7 th grade structured review of selected GLCE's supported by data. | | | | | | | | |
| Develop viable common assessments for all grade levels | On-going | 08-09 and 09-10 | On-going | Dept/PD Time | PD or release time | Guest teachers | On going dept. review | Final products |
| Collaborative meetings will focus on data discussions around common assessments. | All staff | On-going | On-going | Dept/PD Time | Building schedule of meetings | No cost | Meeting Schedule and Minutes | Data Director Results These meetings will result in increased student achievement in Science (MEAP, ACT/EXPLORE, & Common Assessments) |
| Students with disabilities will continue to | Special Education Staff, Regular education staff, | On-going | On-going | Grade Level Team Time | | No cost | Grade Level Team Minutes | Increased MEAP and Common Assessment results |

| | | | | | | | | |
|---|-------------|----------|----------|-------------------|-------------------------|--|---|--|
| receive consistent support through Co-Teaching Model. | Principal | | | | | | | |
| Continued SIOP training for Science instructors | All Science | On-going | On-going | District training | District guest teachers | | Students scheduled into classes with trained SIOP instructors | Increased MEAP and Common Assessment results |

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

- MEAP Strand and Item Analysis
- MB School Improvement Plan
- ACT/Explore
- Common assessments
- Student science grades.

What Professional Learning activities will you need to provide to support the successful implementation of this strategy/action?

- PD time to develop common assessments based on new Science GLCE's
- New curriculum reviewed/purchased aligned to GLCE's and assessed with common assessments
- Continued refinement of Inquiry Based Learning Instruction (based on research stated in Science and Technology Concepts for Middle Schools (STC/MS))

How has the school integrated its available fiscal resources to support this strategy and action steps? District is committed to providing time and money for purchase and implementation of new curricular resources beginning in the Fall of 2010

How has the school assessed the need for, and integrated the use of, telecommunications and informational technology to support this strategy and action steps? Data Director Test Building/Data Analysis



State of Michigan

Macatawa Bay School Improvement Planning

School: Macatawa Bay Middle School

School Year:2008-09

Section I: Comprehensive Analysis Report on Student Achievement

Content Area: Social Studies

Active Goal

Maintenance Goal

Revised Goal

Student Goal Statement: All students will be proficient in Social Studies

Statement of gap in student achievement (Need Statement):

In 6th grade during the past three years, the percentage of students scoring proficient on the MEAP decreased between the 1st and 2nd year, and increased between the 2nd and 3rd year. The percentage of students scoring proficient on the MEAP was lower in the 2nd and 3rd year than it was in the 1st.

Significant gaps (5% or greater) exist in grade 6 for the last 3 years between:

- Students with Disabilities and Students without Disabilities.
- Economically Disadvantaged and Non-economically Disadvantaged.
- English Language Learners and Non-English Language Learners.
- Hispanic and Caucasian

*A 5% gap existed between Multiracial and Caucasian students in two of the three years.

In 9th grade during the past three years, there has been a consistent decline in the percentage of students scoring proficient on the MEAP.

Significant gaps (5% or greater) exist in grade 9 for the last 3 years between:

- Students with Disabilities and Students without Disabilities.
- Economically Disadvantaged and Non-economically Disadvantaged.
- English Language Learners and Non-English Language Learners.
- African American and Caucasian
- Hispanic and Caucasian
- Asian/Pacific Islander and Caucasian
- Multiracial and Caucasian

Contributing Cause for the gap in student achievement:

- Limited use of district demographic data to inform decisions regarding program development and implementation, and corresponding professional development.
- Limited use of research-based strategies to address the learning needs of diverse demographic
- Special Education students have received accommodations on classroom assessments that are not aligned with the allowed accommodations on the MEAP.
- Some English Language Learners have received equal access to the regular education social studies curriculum for only one year.
- The current curriculum is based on the state Grade Level Content Expectations (GLCE'S) and the most recent MEAP was based on the old state benchmarks.

- Difficulty understanding language and test vocabulary on the MEAP.

List the multiple sources of data used to identify the gap in student achievement: 6th and 9th grade MEAP

Section II: Comprehensive Analysis Report on System Processes and Practices

Listed below are the challenges from the Comprehensive Needs Assessment Strand reports, the EdYES! Report, the Standards Assessment Report or the Self Assessment Report that were aligned with this content area goal to be included in this School Improvement Plan. (These should be addressed as strategies/action steps in your SIP in Section III)

| Strand 1: Teaching for Learning | Strand 2: Leadership | Strand 3: Personnel & Professional Learning | Strand 4: School & Community Relations | Strand 5: Data & Info. Management |
|--|--|--|---|--|
| | S2 – Shared Leadership: Collaborative Inquiry | S2- Professional Learning: Results Driven | | |
| | | | | |

Section III: Plan to Accomplish Student Achievement Goals

Measurable Objective Statement to support Goal: By the fall of 2012, 85% of students in each grade level will be proficient in Social Studies as measured by the MEAP, common assessments, and a year end assessment. Additionally, each subgroup will increase the percentage of students that are proficient in Social Studies by ten percentage points annually or have at least 85% of students proficient in Social Studies.

For this objective, list the multiple measures of assessments to be used that will provide authentic assessment of pupils' achievement, skills, and competencies: MEAP, common assessments, and year end assessment.

Strategy Statement: Teachers will research best practices that focus on vocabulary (content and test), reading, curriculum realignment, and data-driven curriculum incorporating collaboration among grade level teachers, and sharing of strategies and results.

| Action Steps | Staff Responsible | Timeline for Activity | | Resources Needed | | | Monitoring Plan | Evidence of Success |
|---|---|------------------------------|------------|-------------------------|-----------------------|---------------|---|---|
| | | Begin | End | Resource | Source | Amount | | |
| Realign middle school curriculum to the new GLCE's. Adopt and implement resources to support teaching the new GLCE's | 6 – 8 social studies teachers | Sept. 2008 | June 2009 | Work sessions | Gen. fund | | Department Head and Assistant Superintendent for Teaching and Learning will monitor progress of committee work. | Curriculum documents. Implementation of the realigned curriculum fall of 2009. |
| SIOP (Sheltered Instruction Observation Protocol) Training. | ELL Director, Social Studies teachers (1 per grade level), and Principal. | Sept. 2008 | Ongoing | Michelle Williams | Title III & Gen. Fund | | Training schedules Coaching and observation records Teachers reflections and evaluation | Teacher observations of impact on student performance in the classroom |

| | | | | | | | | |
|--|--|--------------|---|---|-----------------------------|--------------------------|---|--|
| | | | | | | | | |
| SIOP trained teachers will share strategies at department meetings. | Department head, SIOP trained teachers, and Principal | Sept 2008 | Ongoing | Schedule of meetings. | | | Meeting minutes | Meeting minutes reflect SIOP training. Observation of strategies being used during walkthroughs. |
| Development and implementation of common assessments. | 6 – 8 social studies teachers. | Sept. 2008 | June, 2009 | Work sessions Test Banks Data Director | Gen. Fund Publishers | NA \$5.90/student | Meeting schedules and minutes. | Assessments documents. Increased scores on MEAP & MME. Increased classroom performance. (Grades) |
| Staff will review “Classroom Instruction that Works “ by Robert Marzano | 6 – 8 social studies teachers. | January 2009 | October 2009 | Book by Marzano | | | Survey of staff | Results of survey. |
| Teachers will create and use a toolbox for vocabulary and reading that contains lists, strategies, templates, etc. | 6 – 8 social studies teachers. Technology Support | January 2009 | Fall 2009 *Resources will continue to be added after 09/09 | 1. Marzano 2. SIOP 3. Literacy Framework 4. Michigan Department of Education (MDE) Toolkit | | | Quarterly department meetings. | MEAP data Data from formative assessments. Minutes |
| Professional Development time to work on toolbox. | 6 – 8 social studies teachers | Fall 2009 | Spring 2010 | | | | | |
| Four Department meetings a year will focus on effective strategies and data. | 6 – 8 social studies teachers | Sept. 2009 | Fall 2012 | Attendance at meetings by Social Studies teachers | | | Attendance by designated administrator. | - Agendas and minutes - Increase in assessment scores. |
| Using data, teachers will monitor and | 6 – 8 social studies teachers | Fall 2009 | Fall 2012 | Department Toolbox | | | Peer Coaching | Increase in assessment scores. |

| | | | | | | | | |
|--|---|--------------|---|---|--|--|--|--|
| adjust instruction and do timely interventions for students using research based strategies. | | | | Data Director | | | | |
| Realign the curriculum with the GLCE's. Includes benchmarking assessments. | 1 person per grade level per building, plus the department chair. | January 2008 | Spring 2011 *Work will continue annually | - MDE Toolkit - SCoPE Curriculum and Lessons | | | Quarterly department meetings | - Curriculum maps - Benchmarked assessments - Increase in assessment scores. |
| Staff will read "Improving Student Learning One Teacher at a Time" by Jane E. Pollock and discuss at four department meetings. | 6 – 8 social studies teachers | October 2009 | May 2010 | Book by Pollock | | | - Survey of staff. - Meeting minutes. | Results of survey. |
| Professional Development for writing assessments and creating alternative assessments | 6 – 8 social studies teachers | Fall of 2009 | Spring 2010 | | | | Attendance at professional development. | - Quality, aligned assessments created for common assessments. - Year-end assessment. |

Other Required Information

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

- "Classroom Instruction that Works " by Robert Marzano
- Marzano's research on the positive impact of aligned curriculum.
- S.I.O.P.
- "Improving Student Learning One Teacher at a Time" by Jane E. Pollock
- SCoPE Curriculum and Lessons (Oakland Intermediate School District)
- MDE Toolkit

What Professional Learning activities will you need to provide to support the successful implementation of this strategy/action?

- Release time to work on the Toolbox.
- Assessment writing training and time to create assessments.

- Release time for benchmarking assessments.

How has the school integrated its available fiscal resources to support this strategy and action steps?

How has the school assessed the need for, and integrated the use of, telecommunications and informational technology to support this strategy and action steps?

- Assistance is needed from Technology Support to create the toolbox on a shared drive.
- Data Director training.

Stakeholder Involvement

List the names and positions of the stakeholders (staff, parents, community/business members and, as appropriate, students) who were involved in the planning, design, monitoring, and evaluation of this plan.

| School Improvement Planning Team Members ❁ | | | |
|--|-----------|-----------------|--------|
| Name | Signature | Position | E-mail |
| Mike Fine | | Principal | |
| Cara Montgomery | | Instructor | |
| Jessica McClain | | Instructor | |
| Linda Pinkham | | Asst. Principal | |
| | | | |
| | | | |
| | | | |

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

There are processes in place for implementing a school improvement plan. The following are some examples;

**West Ottawa Leadership Team (WOLT)
BOE Policy and Guidelines
Department and Grade Level Meetings
Data analysis at the building and district level**

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

**School Improvement meetings with Parent Representatives
Annual School Report Meeting
World Café (community input regarding current and future academic programming)
Building and District Newsletters
BOE Meetings and Minutes
5th → 6th Parent Transition Meetings
Advanced Coursework Parent Meetings
Parent Planning Forums initiated in 2008-2009
8th Grade Transition Meeting**

Describe how school and student information and progress will be shared with all stakeholders in a language they can understand. ❁

Meetings

Newsletters

Parent Groups

Parent/Teacher Conferences

Statement of Non-Discrimination

Federal Office of Civil Rights

The school complies with all federal laws and regulations prohibiting discrimination and with all requirements and regulations of the U.S. Department of Education. It is the policy of this school that no person on the basis of race, color, religion, national origin or ancestry, age, gender, height, weight, marital status or disability shall be subjected to discrimination in any program, service or activity for which the district/school is responsible, or for which it receives financial assistance from the U.S. Department of Education.

Name and Title of District Contact: **James Nicolette, Assistant Superintendent of Teaching and Learning**

Address: **1138 136th Avenue, Holland, MI 49424**

Telephone Number: **(616) 738-5700**

References:

Title VI of the Civil Rights Act of 1964,
Title IX of the Education Amendments of 1972,
Section 504 of the Rehabilitation Act of 1973,
The Age Discrimination Act of 1975,
The Americans with Disabilities Act of 1990
Elliott-Larsen prohibits discrimination against religion.