Steelton-Highspire El Sch

School Improvement Plan

07/01/2014 - 06/30/2018

School Profile

Demographics

Steelton-Highspire El Sch

250 Reynders Avenue
Steelton, PA 17113
(717)704-3826

Federal Accountability Designation: Focus
Title I Status: Yes
Schoolwide Status: Yes
Principal: Scott Smith
Superintendent: Travis Waters

Stakeholder Involvement

Name	Role
Travis Waters	Administrator : School Improvement Plan
Rachael Slade	Board Member : School Improvement Plan
Natasha Woods	Board Member : School Improvement Plan
Megan Byrnes	Building Principal : School Improvement Plan
Scott Smith	Building Principal : School Improvement Plan
Cynthia Goles	Elementary School Teacher - Regular Education : School Improvement Plan
Elayne Thomas	Elementary School Teacher - Regular Education : School Improvement Plan
Sarah Kelly	Intermediate Unit Staff Member : School Improvement Plan
Karen Harris	Parent : School Improvement Plan

Federal Programs

School Improvement

All Title I Schools required to complete improvement plans must assure to the Pennsylvania Department of Education the school's compliance with the following expectations by developing and implementing an improvement plan or otherwise taking actions that meet the expectations described by the Assurances listed below.**Assurances 1 through 12**

The school has verified the following Assurances:

- **Assurance 1**: This School Improvement Plan contains Action Plans that address each reason why this school failed to make Annual Measurable Objectives (AMOs) and/or is identified in the lowest 10% of Title I schools.

- **Assurance 2**: The resources needed for full implementation of the action plans herein documented have been identified and the necessary approvals obtained to allow the procurement and allocation of these resources.

- **Assurance 3**: Documentation of the resources needed for full implementation of the action plans herein documented; including specific, related budgetary information, is available for review upon request by the LEA or SEA.

- **Assurance 4**: If designated as a Priority or Focus School the district has determined whole-school meaningful interventions directly associated with the unmet AMO(s).

- **Assurance 5**: The school improvement plan covers a two-year period.

- **Assurance 6**: The school has adopted and/or continued policies and practices concerning the school's core academic subjects that have the greatest likelihood of improving student achievement.

- **Assurance 7**: High performing LEAs with varied demographic conditions have shown they share common characteristics. The following nine characteristics are embedded in the plan:

    o   Clear and Shared Focus

    o   High Standards and Expectations

    o   Effective Leadership

    o   High Levels of Collaboration and Communication

    o   Curriculum, Instruction and Assessment Aligned with Standards

- o Frequent Monitoring of Teaching and Learning

- o Focused Professional Development

- o Supportive Learning Environment

- o High Levels of Community and Parent Involvement

- **Assurance 8**: Focus Schools must implement locally developed interventions associated with a minimum of one of the below principles, while Priority Schools must implement all seven:

  - o Providing strong leadership by: (1) reviewing the performance of the current principal; (2) either replacing the principal if such a change is necessary to ensure strong and effective leadership or demonstrating to the State Education Agency that the current principal has a track record in improving achievement and has the ability to lead the turnaround effort; and (3) providing the principal with operational flexibility in the areas of scheduling, staff, curriculum and budget.

  - o Ensuring that teachers are effective and able to improve instruction by: (1) reviewing the quality of all staff and retaining only those who are determined to be effective and have the ability to be successful in the turnaround effort; and (2) preventing ineffective teachers from transferring to these schools.

  - o Redesign the school day, week, or year to include additional time for student learning and teacher collaboration

  - o Strengthen the school's instructional program based on student needs and ensuring that the instructional program is research-based, rigorous, and aligned with state academic content standards.

  - o Use data to inform instruction and for continuous improvement, including providing time for collaboration on the use of data.

  - o Establish a school environment that improves school safety and discipline and addresses other non-academic factors that impact student achievement, such as students' social, emotional and health needs.

  - o Provide ongoing mechanisms for family and community engagement

- **Assurance 9**: The school improvement plan delineates responsibilities fulfilled by the school, the LEA and the SEA serving the school under the plan.

- **Statement 10**: Establish specific annual, measurable targets for continuous and substantial progress by each relevant subgroup, which will ensure all such groups of students, update to align with the new AMOs to close the achievement gap

- **Statement 11**: A mentoring/induction program used with teachers new to the school exists; the essential elements of the mentoring/induction program are documented and the documentation is available for review upon request by LEA or SEA authorities.

- **Statement 12**: All parents with enrolled students will receive an annual notification letter which includes the reasons for its identification as Priority or Focus and the school's plan to improve student achievement.

Assurance 13

The school is communicating with parents regarding school improvement efforts via the following strategies:

- School web site

Assurance for Priority Schools (Annually Updated SIP)

The school has indicated the following response to indicate if it has completed an evaluation with the assistance of our Academic Recovery Liaison:

No

Coordination of Programs

Technical Assistance

The LEA provides guidance, technical assistance and support to schools developing schoolwide programs in the areas of needs assessment, comprehensive planning, implementation, and evaluation of schoolwide program and requirements.

Describe the technical assistance provided. Explain why it was considered high quality technical assistance.

High quality assistance was provided by the Federal Programs coordinator through various individual meetings with building principals. During these meetings, principals were provided guidance and changes to Title 1. Building funds and positions that were being used with building funds were provided to the principals during Principal Meetings. Additionally, principals can attend Title I conferences, Pattan workshops and trainings but they are not required.

Provider	Meeting Date	Type of Assistance
IU 15	2/16/2017 12:00:00 AM	Title I Training
IU 15	5/18/2017 12:00:00 AM	Title I Training
Sarah Kelly	4/20/2017 12:00:00 AM	School Improvement Plan

Student Assessment of Progress
Describe strategies or processes that have included teachers in the decisions regarding the use of academic assessments to improve the achievement of individual students and the overall instructional program.

During PLC and data meetings teachers make instructional decisions based on timely data. This data includes DIBELS, DRA, PVAAS and PSSA (annual), CDTs (SY 14-15 to 16-17 SY), benchmark assessments, and district and school-wide writing prompts. This data is used to create small group reading instruction groups which are formally created and changed quarterly. Individual students are progress moniotired bi-weekly and changes are made as student growth indicates. Teachers utilize teacher made and progress monitoring assessments to determine student growth in addition to follow up interventions for students.

In order to assist students in meeting challenging achievement goals, increased instructional time is a necessity. Please indicate (yes/no) the options for increased time that students will have access to if identified as at-risk of failing or failing to meet achievement standards.

Options	Yes or No
Extended School Day/Tutoring Programs	No
Reading	No
Math	No
Science	No
Before School	No
After School	No
Lunch/Study Periods	No
Summer School Program	Yes
Reading	Yes
Math	Yes
Science	No
In-class Instructional Support	No
Pull Out Instructional Support	No

Coordination and Integration of Services and Programs

The purpose of a Title 1 Schoolwide Program is to improve the educational program of the entire school and to improve the educational opportunities for ALL students. In carrying out the SWP, schools are encouraged to consolidate/integrate funds from state, local and federal programs. This consolidation of funds provides flexibility in the use of the funds and

maximizes the opportunities for students, teachers and parents. Funds eligible for consolidation are:

• Any federal education program administered by the United States Department of Education, except Reading First.

o Competitive/discretionary grants may be part of the consolidation, but activities described within the competitive/discretionary grant application MUST be carried out.

• All state and local resources available to the school (If state and local funds are consolidated within the SWP, the school must ensure that any state and/or local requirements regarding the use of funds are met.)

Is your school consolidating funds?

No, the school does not intend to consolidate the funds.

Federal Grant Program	Amount of Grant

State/Local Grant Program	Amount of Grant

Needs Assessment

School Accomplishments

Accomplishment #1:

PVAAS ELA

2015-2016:

- PVASS data indicates that Grade 6 met the Standard for PA Academic Growth. A 3-year average growth measure indicates significant evidence of meeting the PA Academic Standard for Growth for grade 6. Additionally, students who were predicted to be Below Basic showed moderate evidence of exceeding the standard for PA Academic Growth.

2014-2015:

- PVAAS data indicates there is significant evidence that 6th grade exceeded the standard for PA academic growth. In grades 4 and 6 the second lowest quintile of students exceeded the standard for PA academic growth.

2013-2014:

- PVAAS data indicates there is significant evidence that grade 4 and 6 exceeded the standard for PA academic growth. In grade 4 there is moderate evidence that students who were predicted to be Basic and Below Basic exceeded the standard for PA academic growth.

- In grade 6 there is moderate evidence that all predicted performance groups exceeded the standard for PA academic growth.

2012-2013:

- PVAAS data indicates there is significant evidence that 6th grade exceeded the standard for PA academic growth. In addition, students who were predicted to score below basic in 6th grade showed moderate evidence that the group exceeded the standard for PA academic growth.

- PVAAS data indicated 4th grade students who were predicted to score basic showed moderate evidence that the group exceeded the standard for PA academic growth.

- PVAAS data indicated that 5th grade students who were predicted to score below basic showed moderate evidence that the group exceeded the standard for PA academic growth.

- PVAAS data indicated that 4th grade students who were predicted to score Below Basic or Basic showed moderate evidence that the group exceeded the standard for PA academic growth. The students who were predicted to score Proficient of Advanced showed evidence that the group met the standard for PA academic growth.

- PVAAS data indicated that 6th grade students who were predicted to score Below Basic, Basic, Proficient, Advanced showed moderate evidence that the group exceeded the standard for PA academic growth.

Accomplishment #2:
PVAAS Math

2015-2016

- PVAAS data indicates a 3-year average growth measure in grade 6 indicates students are significantly exceeding the PA Academic Standard for Growth. In addition, students who were predicted to be Basic in Grade 6 showed significant evidence they exceeded the standard for PA Academic Growth.

2014-2015

- PVAAS data indicates that in 4th - 6th grades students in the lowest quintile met or exceeded the standard for PA academic growth.

- In 4th and 6th grades students in the second quintile met the standard for PA academic growth.

- The Special Education subgroup in 4th and 5th grade exceeded the PA academic standard for growth, and outperformed all students within the lowest quintile.

2013-2014

- PVAAS data indicates that the 6th grade showed significant evidence that they exceeded the standard for PA academic growth.

Accomplishment #3:
PVAAS Science

2015-2016

- Students in Grade 4 who were predicted to be Below Basic showed moderate evidence of exceeding the standard for PA Academic Growth.

2014-2015

- According to PVAAS 34% of students have a greater than 70% probability of scoring proficient on the 2015 PSSA

2013-2014

- According to 2013-14 PVAAS data 4th grade met the standard for PA academic growth. Specifically, students who were predicted to be Advanced showed moderate evidence of exceeding the standard for PA Academic Growth.

2012-2013

- According to 2012-13 PVAAS data 4th grade met the standard for PA academic growth.

Accomplishment #4:

School Performance Profile:

2012-2013: 51.9

2013-2014: 62.0

2014-2015 - Not available

The increase in the School Performance Profile for the 2014 school year is due to an increase in Science and ELA PSSA scores of proficient and advanced students. Additionally, the school met the target for closing the achievement gap in Science. Math, reading and science growth scores also grew in 2014. The school also received extra credit for students who earned Advanced on the Math, ELA and Science PSSA.

Accomplishment #5:

Attendance

2013-2014

SHES met the attendance rates for PSSAs in Reading and Math

2012-2013

SHES met the attendance rates for PSSAs in Reading and Math.

School Concerns

Concern #1:

The 2015-2016 School Performance Profile is 40.5%.

Concern #2: There is a concern that the administrative team is unable to focus on instructional leadership. **Concern #3:** **PSSA Data** **In 2015-2016**, grades 3-6: 13.04% meeting proficiency in Math. **In 2015-2016**, grades 3-6: 20.65% meeting proficiency in ELA. **In 2015-2016**, grade 4: 28.87% meeting proficiency in Science. **In 2014-2015**, grades 3-6 21.1% of students met or exceeded proficiency in ELA compared to 59.9% of students in Pennsylvania. **In 2014-2015**, grades 3-6 12.7% of students met or exceeded proficiency in Math compared to 39.7% of students in Pennsylvania. **In 2014-2015,** grade 4 44% or students met or exceeded proficiency in Science compared to 67.9% of students in Pennsylvania. **In 2013-2014**, grades 3-6 34.6% of students met or exceeded proficiency in Reading compared to 69.4% of student in Pennsylvania. **In 2013-2014,** grades 3-6 40.9% of students met or exceeded proficiency in Mathematics compared to 73.3% of students in Pennsylvania. **In 2012-2013**, grades 3-6 did not meet the state's level of proficiency (69.0%) in Reading. Students overall: 32.6%

In 2012-2013 grade 4 did not meet the state's level of proficiency (78.6%) in Science.

Student's overall: 47.6%

In 2012-2013, grades 3-6 did not meet the state's level of proficiency (74.7%) in Math. Students overall: 43.1% **Concern #4:**

PVAAS ELA

2015-2016 PVAAS data indicates significant evidence grade 4 did not meet the PA Standard for Academic Growth. Grade 5 indicates moderate evidence of not meeting the PA Standard for Academic Growth.

2013-2014 PVAAS data indicates that there is significant evidence that 5th grade did not meet the standard for PA academic growth in ELA. Students in 5th grade that were predicted to be proficient and advanced did not meet the standard for PA academic growth.

2012-2013 PVAAS data indicates there is moderate evidence that the 4th and 5th grade did not meet the standard for PA academic growth in ELA. In addition, students who were predicted to be proficient and advanced did not meet the standard for PA academic growth.

Concern #5:
PVAAS Math

2015-2016 PVAAS Data indicates that there is significant evidence grades 4 and 5 did not meet the PA Standard for Academic Growth in Math. Grade 6 showed moderate evidence of not meeting the PA Standard for Academic Growth.

2014-2015 PVAAS data indicates that there is significant evidence grade 5 did not meet PA standard for academic growth in Math and moderate evidence that grade 4 did not meet PA standard for academic growth.

2012-2013 PVAAS data indicates in grades 4-6 students did not meet the standard for PA academic growth in Math. In addition, students who were predicted to be proficient and advanced did not meet the standard for PA academic growth.

2013-2014 PVAAS data indicates in grades 4 and 5 students did not meet the standard for PA academic growth in Math.

Concern #6:
PVAAS Science:

2015-2016 PVAAS data indicates significant evidence in grade 4 of not meeting the Standard for PA Academic Growth.

2014-2015 PVAAS data indicates significant evidence in grade 4of not meeting the Standard for PA Academic Growth.

Concern #7:
PBIS

2014-2015 Power School and SWIS data indicates that there are a high number of daily discipline referrals, 705 for the school year. This includes minor referrals which were not tracked in 2013-14.

2013-2014 Power School and SWIS data indicates that there are still a high number of daily discipline referrals, 637 total for the school year.

2012-2013 Power School and SWIS data indicates a high number of daily discipline referrals, 408 total for the school year.

Prioritized Systemic Challenges

Systemic Challenge #1 *(Guiding Question #1)* Ensure that there is a system in the school and/or district that fully ensures the principal is enabled to serve as a strong instructional leader who, in partnership with the school community (students, staff, parents, community, etc.) leads achievement growth and continuous improvement within the school.

> **Aligned Concerns:** There is a concern that the administrative team is unable to focus on instructional leadership.
>
> **PBIS**
>
> **2014-2015** Power School and SWIS data indicates that there are a high number of daily discipline referrals, 705 for the school year. This includes minor referrals which were not tracked in 2013-14.
>
> **2013-2014** Power School and SWIS data indicates that there are still a high number of daily discipline referrals, 637 total for the school year.
>
> **2012-2013** Power School and SWIS data indicates a high number of daily discipline referrals, 408 total for the school year.

Systemic Challenge #2 *(Guiding Question #4)* Ensure that there is a system within the school that fully ensures consistent implementation of effective instructional practices that meet the needs of all students across all classrooms and aligns with the Pennsylvania Framework for Teaching

> **Aligned Concerns: PSSA Data** **In 2015-2016**, grades 3-6: 13.04% meeting proficiency in Math. **In 2015-2016**, grades 3-6: 20.65% meeting proficiency in ELA. **In 2015-2016**, grade 4: 28.87% meeting proficiency in Science. **In 2014-2015**, grades 3-6 21.1% of students met or exceeded proficiency in ELA compared to 59.9% of students in Pennsylvania. **In 2014-2015**, grades 3-6 12.7% of students met or exceeded proficiency in Math compared to 39.7% of students in Pennsylvania. **In 2014-2015,** grade 4 44% or students met or exceeded proficiency in Science compared to 67.9% of students in Pennsylvania. **In 2013-2014**, grades 3-6 34.6% of students met or exceeded proficiency in Reading compared to 69.4% of student in Pennsylvania. **In 2013-2014,** grades 3-6 40.9% of students met or exceeded proficiency in Mathematics compared to 73.3% of students in Pennsylvania. **In 2012-2013**, grades 3-6 did not meet the state's level of proficiency (69.0%) in Reading. Students overall: 32.6%
>
> **In 2012-2013** grade 4 did not meet the state's level of proficiency (78.6%) in Science.
>
> Student's overall: 47.6%
>
> **In 2012-2013,** grades 3-6 did not meet the state's level of proficiency (74.7%) in Math. Students overall: 43.1%
>
> **PVAAS ELA**

2015-2016 PVAAS data indicates significant evidence grade 4 did not meet the PA Standard for Academic Growth. Grade 5 indicates moderate evidence of not meeting the PA Standard for Academic Growth.

2013-2014 PVAAS data indicates that there is significant evidence that 5th grade did not meet the standard for PA academic growth in ELA. Students in 5th grade that were predicted to be proficient and advanced did not meet the standard for PA academic growth.

2012-2013 PVAAS data indicates there is moderate evidence that the 4th and 5th grade did not meet the standard for PA academic growth in ELA. In addition, students who were predicted to be proficient and advanced did not meet the standard for PA academic growth.

PVAAS Math

2015-2016 PVAAS Data indicates that there is significant evidence grades 4 and 5 did not meet the PA Standard for Academic Growth in Math. Grade 6 showed moderate evidence of not meeting the PA Standard for Academic Growth.

2014-2015 PVAAS data indicates that there is significant evidence grade 5 did not meet PA standard for academic growth in Math and moderate evidence that grade 4 did not meet PA standard for academic growth.

2012-2013 PVAAS data indicates in grades 4-6 students did not meet the standard for PA academic growth in Math. In addition, students who were predicted to be proficient and advanced did not meet the standard for PA academic growth.

2013-2014 PVAAS data indicates in grades 4 and 5 students did not meet the standard for PA academic growth in Math.

Systemic Challenge #3 *(Guiding Question #6)* Ensure that there is a system within the school that fully ensures a safe and supportive environment for all students.

Aligned Concerns:

PBIS

2014-2015 Power School and SWIS data indicates that there are a high number of daily discipline referrals, 705 for the school year. This includes minor referrals which were not tracked in 2013-14.

2013-2014 Power School and SWIS data indicates that there are still a high number of daily discipline referrals, 637 total for the school year.

2012-2013 Power School and SWIS data indicates a high number of daily discipline referrals, 408 total for the school year.

Systemic Challenge #4 *(Guiding Question #2)* Ensure that there is a system within the school that fully ensures school-wide use of data that is focused on school improvement and the academic growth of all students

Aligned Concerns: PSSA Data **In 2015-2016**, grades 3-6: 13.04% meeting proficiency in Math. **In 2015-2016**, grades 3-6: 20.65% meeting proficiency in ELA. **In 2015-2016**, grade 4: 28.87% meeting proficiency in Science. **In 2014-2015**, grades 3-6 21.1% of students met or exceeded proficiency in ELA compared to 59.9% of students in Pennsylvania. **In 2014-2015**, grades 3-6 12.7% of students met or exceeded proficiency in Math compared to 39.7% of students in Pennsylvania. **In 2014-2015,** grade 4 44% or students met or exceeded proficiency in Science compared to 67.9% of students in Pennsylvania. **In 2013-2014**, grades 3-6 34.6% of students met or exceeded proficiency in Reading compared to 69.4% of student in Pennsylvania. **In 2013-2014,** grades 3-6 40.9% of students met or exceeded proficiency in Mathematics compared to 73.3% of students in Pennsylvania. **In 2012-2013**, grades 3-6 did not meet the state's level of proficiency (69.0%) in Reading. Students overall: 32.6%

In 2012-2013 grade 4 did not meet the state's level of proficiency (78.6%) in Science.

Student's overall: 47.6%

In 2012-2013, grades 3-6 did not meet the state's level of proficiency (74.7%) in Math. Students overall: 43.1%

PVAAS ELA

2015-2016 PVAAS data indicates significant evidence grade 4 did not meet the PA Standard for Academic Growth. Grade 5 indicates moderate evidence of not meeting the PA Standard for Academic Growth.

2013-2014 PVAAS data indicates that there is significant evidence that 5th grade did not meet the standard for PA academic growth in ELA. Students in 5th grade that were predicted to be proficient and advanced did not meet the standard for PA academic growth.

2012-2013 PVAAS data indicates there is moderate evidence that the 4th and 5th grade did not meet the standard for PA academic growth in ELA. In addition, students who were predicted to be proficient and advanced did not meet the standard for PA academic growth.

PVAAS Math

2015-2016 PVAAS Data indicates that there is significant evidence grades 4 and 5 did not meet the PA Standard for Academic Growth in Math. Grade 6 showed moderate evidence of not meeting the PA Standard for Academic Growth.

2014-2015 PVAAS data indicates that there is significant evidence grade 5 did not meet PA standard for academic growth in Math and moderate evidence that grade 4 did not meet PA standard for academic growth.

2012-2013 PVAAS data indicates in grades 4-6 students did not meet the standard for PA academic growth in Math. In addition, students who were predicted to be proficient and advanced did not meet the standard for PA academic growth.

2013-2014 PVAAS data indicates in grades 4 and 5 students did not meet the standard for PA academic growth in Math.

Systemic Challenge #5 *(Guiding Question #3)* Ensure that there is a system within the school that fully ensures consistent implementation of a standards aligned curriculum framework across all classrooms for all students.

Aligned Concerns: PSSA Data **In 2015-2016**, grades 3-6: 13.04% meeting proficiency in Math. **In 2015-2016**, grades 3-6: 20.65% meeting proficiency in ELA. **In 2015-2016**, grade 4: 28.87% meeting proficiency in Science. **In 2014-2015**, grades 3-6 21.1% of students met or exceeded proficiency in ELA compared to 59.9% of students in Pennsylvania. **In 2014-2015**, grades 3-6 12.7% of students met or exceeded proficiency in Math compared to 39.7% of students in Pennsylvania. **In 2014-2015,** grade 4 44% or students met or exceeded proficiency in Science compared to 67.9% of students in Pennsylvania. **In 2013-2014**, grades 3-6 34.6% of students met or exceeded proficiency in Reading compared to 69.4% of student in Pennsylvania. **In 2013-2014,** grades 3-6 40.9% of students met or exceeded proficiency in Mathematics compared to 73.3% of students in Pennsylvania. **In 2012-2013**, grades 3-6 did not meet the state's level of proficiency (69.0%) in Reading. Students overall: 32.6%

In 2012-2013 grade 4 did not meet the state's level of proficiency (78.6%) in Science.

Student's overall: 47.6%

In 2012-2013, grades 3-6 did not meet the state's level of proficiency (74.7%) in Math. Students overall: 43.1%

PVAAS ELA

2015-2016 PVAAS data indicates significant evidence grade 4 did not meet the PA Standard for Academic Growth. Grade 5 indicates moderate evidence of not meeting the PA Standard for Academic Growth.

2013-2014 PVAAS data indicates that there is significant evidence that 5th grade did not meet the standard for PA academic growth in ELA. Students in 5th grade that were predicted to be proficient and advanced did not meet the standard for PA academic growth.

2012-2013 PVAAS data indicates there is moderate evidence that the 4th and 5th grade did not meet the standard for PA academic growth in ELA. In addition, students who were predicted to be proficient and advanced did not meet the standard for PA academic growth.

PVAAS Math

2015-2016 PVAAS Data indicates that there is significant evidence grades 4 and 5 did not meet the PA Standard for Academic Growth in Math. Grade 6 showed moderate evidence of not meeting the PA Standard for Academic Growth.

2014-2015 PVAAS data indicates that there is significant evidence grade 5 did not meet PA standard for academic growth in Math and moderate evidence that grade 4 did not meet PA standard for academic growth.

2012-2013 PVAAS data indicates in grades 4-6 students did not meet the standard for PA academic growth in Math. In addition, students who were predicted to be proficient and advanced did not meet the standard for PA academic growth.

2013-2014 PVAAS data indicates in grades 4 and 5 students did not meet the standard for PA academic growth in Math.

Systemic Challenge #6 *(Guiding Question #5)* Ensure that the organizational structure, processes, materials, equipment, and human and fiscal resources within the school align with the school's goals for student growth and continuous school improvement.

School Level Plan

Action Plans

Goal #1: Ensure that there is a system in the school and/or district that fully ensures the principal is enabled to serve as a strong instructional leader who, in partnership with the school community (students, staff, parents, community, etc.) leads achievement growth and continuous improvement within the school.

Indicators of Effectiveness:

Type: Interim

Data Source: Leadership Meeting

Specific Targets: please advise

Strategies:

Instructional (Distributive) Leadership Capacity Building

Description:

Identifying effective instructors that demonstrate leadership abilities as a support for growth and development of grade level teams, allowing for administration to strengthen their role as instructional leaders.

SAS Alignment: Instruction

Implementation Steps:

Display school policies and reinforce consistent boundaries while enhancing a positive school climate.

Description:

Students and teachers are aware of school policies and procedures. (PBIS) They are enforced consistently with fidelity. All school personnel use common language to propagate a positive environment. Students, families, and staff feel welcome, safe, and comfortable. There is a high level of learning occurring with minimal disruptions due to behavior problems. A system of rewards is developed for students and staff. Power school and SWIS data will indicate a drop in the number of discipline referrals. This will be ongoing throughout the year.

Evidence: school policy

Start Date: 8/27/2014   **End Date:** 6/1/2018

Program Area(s): Professional Education, Student Services

Supported Strategies:

- Instructional (Distributive) Leadership Capacity Building

Identifying effective teachers

Description:

Utilize PA Framework data to determine teacher effectiveness. Evidence includes walkthrough forms, informal and formal observation reports, evaluation reports. Teacher effectiveness will also be determined by growth of teacher's students as indicated by DIBELS, PVAAS, PSSA.

Start Date: 6/1/2014   **End Date:** 6/1/2018

Program Area(s): Professional Education

Supported Strategies:

- Instructional (Distributive) Leadership Capacity Building

Leadership Opportunities

Description:

Provide leadership opportunities such as: Leadership Team, Grade Level Coordinators, facilitating professional development.

Start Date: 6/1/2014   **End Date:** 6/1/2018

Program Area(s): Professional Education

Supported Strategies:

- Instructional (Distributive) Leadership Capacity Building

Leadership/ Improvement

Description:

Utilize identified leaders as part of the school improvement process. These leaders will facilitate grade level, department, and behavior meetings and will act as a liason between grade levels and administration.

Evidence: Sign in sheets, agendas/protocol

Start Date: 6/1/2014   **End Date:** 6/1/2018

Program Area(s):

Supported Strategies:

- Instructional (Distributive) Leadership Capacity Building

Goal #2: Ensure that there is a system within the school that fully ensures consistent implementation of effective instructional practices that meet the needs of all students across all classrooms and aligns with the Pennsylvania Framework for Teaching

Indicators of Effectiveness:

Type: Annual

Data Source: PVAAS

Specific Targets: All students at least meet the standard for PA Academic Growth

Type: Annual

Data Source: PSSA Reading and Math

Specific Targets: 4% - 5% of Proficient/Advanced increase in PSSA Reading and Math

Strategies:

Professional Development for Effective Instructional Practices

Description:

Professional development plan will be focused on effective instructional practices as identified in the Framework for Teaching rubric.

SAS Alignment: Instruction

Data Protocol

Description:

Develop data protocol to analyze student/class/grade level/school data, current instructional practices, targeted areas, action steps, progress checks.

SAS Alignment: Instruction

Instructional Programming

Description:

Design schools instructional program based on student need to include flexible scheduling, flexible grouping, and implementation of SAS aligned curriculum.

SAS Alignment: Standards, Instruction

Implementation Steps:

Ensure the usage of research-based instructional strategies in all classrooms

Description:

Students will be meeting and exceeding learning expectations and goals established by administration and teachers. Teachers will be delivering content using rigorous instructional methods and best practice.

Start Date: 8/21/2014   **End Date:** 6/2/2018

Program Area(s): Professional Education, Teacher Induction, Educational Technology

Supported Strategies:

- Professional Development for Effective Instructional Practices

Ensure the usage of SAS materials and the SAS website along with differentiated instruction.

Description:

Students will be meeting and exceeding learning expectations and goals developed by administration and teachers. Teachers will be utilizing information from SAS and providing highly differentiated instruction that meets the needs of all learners in the classroom.

Start Date: 8/27/2014   **End Date:** 6/12/2018

Program Area(s): Professional Education, Special Education, Educational Technology

Supported Strategies:

- Professional Development for Effective Instructional Practices
- Instructional Programming

Conduct walk-throughs and analyze data

Description:

Students will be meeting and exceeding learning expectations developed by administration and teachers. Teachers will be consistently implementing effective instructional practices such as formative assessments, differentiated instruction, rigorous delivery, cooperative learning, and materials found on the SAS website. This will be measured by gathering data from learning walks and analyzing that data as a leadership team. This data will be shared in professional development sessions. Teachers will work effectively in professional learning communities to share strategies and student work.

Start Date: 8/21/2014   **End Date:** 6/12/2018

Program Area(s): Professional Education, Special Education, Educational Technology

Supported Strategies:

- Data Protocol
- Instructional Programming

Develop District-Wide Instructional Best Practices

Description:

All teachers will have access to district-wide instructional best practices that can be used for differentiated instruction and the creation of rigorous lesson plans.

Start Date: 8/27/2014   **End Date:** 6/2/2018

Program Area(s): Professional Education, Teacher Induction, Special Education, Gifted Education, Educational Technology

Supported Strategies:

- Instructional Programming

Professional Development Calendar

Description:

Develop a yearly professional development schedule focusing on best instructional practices identified as areas of need through formal/informal observation data.

Start Date: 2/14/2014   **End Date:** 8/25/2017

Program Area(s): Professional Education

Supported Strategies:

- Professional Development for Effective Instructional Practices
- Data Protocol

Determine grade level meeting schedule and hold collaborative meetings

Description:

Schedule consistent meeting dates and times to problem solve consistencies and inconsistencies of instructional practices based on walkthrough data and make needed adjustments

Start Date: 10/15/2014   **End Date:** 6/1/2018

Program Area(s):

Supported Strategies:

- Data Protocol
- Instructional Programming

Schedule collaborative planning time per grade level

Description:

Create school-wide daily schedule that provides common collaborative planning time for grade level teams.

Start Date: 7/1/2014   **End Date:** 7/1/2017

Program Area(s):

Supported Strategies:

- Data Protocol
- Instructional Programming

Develop a standard process for analyzing instructional practices and creating an action plan.

Description:

Create a standard protocol/process with guiding questions for examining instructional practices, along with a basic action plan for focusing on determined instructional strategies.

Start Date: 1/15/2015   **End Date:** 6/10/2017

Program Area(s):

Supported Strategies:

- Instructional Programming

Scheduling

Description:

Create a school-wide schedule/program to accomodate ability grouping within grade levels (for reading and math).

Start Date: 6/1/2014   **End Date:** 7/31/2017

Program Area(s):

Supported Strategies:

- Instructional Programming

Develop a standard process for analyzing sets of data.

Description:

Develop a process for analyzing various data sets that is consistently utilized throughout the school and informs instructional decisions. Lesson plans and instruction, informed by data, will indicate implementation along with student progress in areas assessed and analyzed.

Start Date: 9/1/2014   **End Date:** 6/1/2018

Program Area(s): Educational Technology

Supported Strategies:

- Data Protocol
- Instructional Programming

Goal #3: Ensure that there is a system within the school that fully ensures a safe and supportive environment for all students.

Indicators of Effectiveness:

Type: Interim

Data Source: SWIS Data 2016-2017

Specific Targets: A reduction of physical aggression referrals by 1% per month

Strategies:

Positive Behavior Intervention and Support

Description:

Positive behavior support strives to use a system to understand what maintains an individual's challenging behavior...It also summarizes and creates a hypothesis about the behavior, and directly observes the behavior and takes data to get a baseline. The positive behavior support process involves goal identification, information gathering, hypothesis development, support plan design, implementation and monitoring...Strategies are needed that teachers and parents are able and willing to use and that have an impact on the child's ability to participate in community and school activities."

SAS Alignment: Safe and Supportive Schools

Implementation Steps:

Provide Professional Development to All Staff

Description:

CAIU PBIS Consultant provides initial training to all staff members.

Evidence: Sign in sheets

Start Date: 8/19/2015   **End Date:** 8/21/2017

Program Area(s):

Supported Strategies:

- Positive Behavior Intervention and Support

Provided Professional Development to targeted group of teachers

Description:

CAIU PBIS Consultant will provide targeted training to small groups of teachers.

Evidence: Sign in sheets, agenda

Start Date: 8/19/2015   **End Date:** 8/21/2015

Program Area(s):

Supported Strategies:

- Positive Behavior Intervention and Support

PBIS Building Capacity

Description:

The PBIS consultant visits the school bi-monthly to evaluate data with the teachers and principal, as well as model behavior techniques. This will continue until 5/2017

Evidence: Consultant visit records, modified lessons

Start Date: 8/22/2015   **End Date:** 5/31/2017

Program Area(s):

Supported Strategies:

- Positive Behavior Intervention and Support

Goal #4: Ensure that there is a system within the school that fully ensures consistent implementation of a standards aligned curriculum framework across all classrooms for all students.

Indicators of Effectiveness:

Type: Interim

Data Source: Curriculum Maps created by classroom teachers aligned to the PA Common Core (Math and ELA) or the PA Academic Standards

Specific Targets: Increased student performance on classroom assessments

Strategies:

Curriculum Development and Alignment

Description:

The SHSD will begin developing and aligning a curriculum in the following areas: math, ELA, science and social studies. Studies have shown that an alignment of curriculum to state adopted standards increases student success and provides preparation for achievement tests and post-secondary endeavors.

At this time, the district is conducting a needs assessment on how to embark on implementing this strategy, but some curriculum writing will begin summer 2016 for Math and ELA and continue during the school year.

SAS Alignment: Standards, Curriculum Framework, Materials & Resources

Implementation Steps:

Curriculum Mapping

Description:

Teachers will meet monthly in department level teams to review department standards using the SAS portal and work as a team to create curriculum maps that allign student learning across grade levels.

Start Date: 8/26/2015   **End Date:** 6/30/2017

Program Area(s):

Supported Strategies:

- Curriculum Development and Alignment

Appendix: Professional Development Implementation Step Details

No Professional Development Implementation Steps have been identified for Steelton-Highspire El Sch.

Assurance of Quality and Accountability

We, the undersigned, hereby certify that the school level plan for Steelton-Highspire El Sch in the Steelton-Highspire SD has been duly reviewed by a *Quality Review Team* convened by the Superintendent of Schools and formally approved by the district's Board of Education, per guidelines required by the Pennsylvania Department of Education.

We hereby affirm and assure the Secretary of Education that the school level plan:

- Addresses all the **required components** prescribed by the Pennsylvania Department of Education

- Meets **ESEA requirements for Title I schools**

- Reflects **sound educational practice**

- Has a **high probability of improving student achievement**

- Has sufficient **District leadership and support to ensure successful implementation**

With this *Assurance of Quality & Accountability*, we, therefore, request that the Secretary of Education and the Pennsylvania Department of Education grant formal approval to implement the school level plan submitted by Steelton-Highspire El Sch in the Steelton-Highspire SD for the 2014-2018 school-year.

No signature has been provided

Superintendent/Chief Executive Officer

No signature has been provided

Board President

No signature has been provided

IU Executive Director

Evaluation of School Improvement Plan

2016-2017 Improvement Evaluation

Describe the success from the past year.

- We are implementing our school wide behavior program (PBIS) with fidelity.

- We have implemented teacher training modules specifically targeting classroom management.

- We provided reading intervention strategies training from the IU.

- Completing vertical alignment of core subjects and beginning curriculum mapping.

Describe the continuing areas of concern from the past year.

- Our staff needs more support with reading intervention strategies.

- We are in need of a reading specialist to assist our teachers.

- Continue to develop curriculum maps for the core subjects.

Describe the initiatives that have been revised.
This narrative is empty.

2015-2016 Improvement Evaluation

Describe the success from the past year.

- Instructional leaders within the grade level teams have been facilitating data team meetings to analyze data and inform instruction.

- Teachers are currently vertically aligning curriculum in all subject areas to ensure consistency and fidelity of standards taught K-6.

- With the support of the IU consultant and identified teacher leaders, the school has implemented a school-wide behavior program. Grade level teams meet to analyze behavioral data and address areas of need. Specific teachers participated in a PLC to improve classroom management strategies.

Describe the continuing areas of concern from the past year.

- Although assessments are being given and analyzed, consistency among grade level assessments is still a concern.

- There is an increased need for professional development on effective instructional practices. Building administration is not able to adequately observe classrooms to ensure the use of research based instructional strategies.

- Although there is a tier 1 system in place for behavior, we have not been able to provide adequate tier 2 and 3 supports due to lack of resources. The school has relied on outside agency support for necessary social emotional and mental health supports. This has negatively effected the school environment. Additional training in the areas of classroom management and deescalation is needed.

Describe the initiatives that have been revised.

Instructional grouping across grade levels was not implemented for math due to a lack of resources and instructional time. Teachers differentiated materials within their classrooms to address student needs.

2014-2015 Improvement Evaluation

Describe the success from the first year plan.

Through the first year of the plan the elementary school was able to identify effective instructors that demonstrate leadership abilities. These leaders have served as grade level coordinators, department chairs and facilitated professional development. In the first year the schedule was created to include intervention time for flexible grouping for reading in grades 1-6. The schedule also allowed for teachers to meet collaboratively as a grade level to analyze student data and instructional practices.

Describe the continuing areas of concern from the first year plan.

A reduction in staff, more specifically the loss of interventionists, eliminated small group reading instructions from certified reading specialist outside of the core instruction from the general education teacher. These staff members assisted in analyzing student data, the RTII process, and essential duties throughout the school day. It was necessary for administration to distribute and absorb these tasks and duties. In addition, administration needs to be able to focus more on being instructional leaders as opposed to disciplinarians.

Describe the initiatives that have been revised.

The priorities and initiatives will remain the same through the 2015/2016 school year.