District Improvement Plan

Archive Date: 10/19/2012, Report Status: Submitted

School Year: 2012 - 2013
District Name: Coopersville Area Public School District
ISD/RESA: Ottawa Area ISD
Grades Served: PK,K,2,3,4,5,6,7,8,9,10,11,12
Mr. Ronald Veldman

Building Code: 70120

District Approval of Plan:

_____
Authorized Official Signature and Date

Board of Education Approval of Plan:

_____
Authorized Official Signature and Date

District Improvement Plan

Contents

Introduction 3
District Information 5
Vision, Mission and Beliefs 6
Goals 7
Goal 1: All students will achieve proficiency in Science 7
Goal 2: All students will achieve proficiency in Social Studies 11
Goal 3: Math Proficiency 15
Goal 4: Reading Goal 22
Resource Profile 30
Assurances 31
Stakeholders 33
Statement of Non-Discrimination 34
Supporting Documentation 35
Conclusion 36

Introduction

The Michigan Department of Education, Office of Education Improvement and Innovation and Office of Field Services has developed a series of documents and tools that are designed to assist schools in the creation and use of an **Action Portfolio** that will guide and inform the school's Continuous School Improvement Planning Process.

The **Action Portfolio** begins with the **Michigan School Improvement Framework (MSIF)**. The Framework was designed to:

- Provide schools and districts with a comprehensive framework that describes the elements of effective schools.
- Provide schools and districts in our state with a common way of describing the processes and protocols of practice of effective schools.
- Give direction to, support, and enhance the school improvement planning process.

The School Improvement Framework **Rubrics** assess the framework at the benchmark level, and provide a continuum of practice that allows buildings to identify gaps that exist between where they are in their current practice and where they want to be. The rubrics also include the EdYES! Performance Indicators that schools must use for their annual self-assessment.

The **Comprehensive Needs Assessment (CNA)** is another tool that has been developed as a part of the **Action Portfolio**. This process examines building demographics, system processes and protocols of practices, instructional program, and disaggregated student academic achievement data, so that the following questions can be answered:

- Who do we serve?
- How do we do business?
- Where are we now?
- Where do we want to be?
- What and where are the gaps?
- What is/are the root cause(s) for the gaps?
- How will we get to where we want to be?
- How will we evaluate our efforts and progress?

The CNA will help a school align these system challenges with the student achievement goals the school will establish. Ensuring that your systems are aligned with the elements of effective schools, to support your instructional program goals and objectives, is the first step to establishing the continuous school improvement process.

The **District Improvement Plan (DIP)** has been designed to provide schools and districts with a common planning template that addresses student learning and system needs that have been identified through the schools' Comprehensive Needs Assessment. It has also been designed to address any federal, state and locally required elements that must be contained in a School Improvement Plan.

The School Improvement Framework, Rubrics, CNA, and the School Improvement Planning template were developed as a comprehensive and continuous process that can provide schools and districts with a way to look at and discuss internal systems and assess where the school is, in relationship to these elements of effective schools.

Copies of these documents can be obtained on the web at: www.mi.gov/schoolimprovement

District Information

District:	**Coopersville Area Public School District**
ISD/RESA:	**Ottawa Area ISD**
Public/Non-Public:	**Public**
Grades:	**PK,K,2,3,4,5,6,7,8,9,10,11,12**
District Code Number:	**70120**
City:	**COOPERSVILLE**
State/Province:	**Michigan**
Country:	**United States**

Vision, Mission and Beliefs

Vision Statement

All students are entitled to a quality program of instruction based on equal opportunity to learn regardless of gender, family background, differences or learning styles. A positive environment is the key to promoting student, staff, parent and community relationships.

Mission Statement

It is the mission of Coopersville Area Public Schools to inspire all students to embrace a life-long love of learning, to achieve their goals, and to be compassionate citizens who contribute to the global community.

Beliefs Statement

We believe that ...

- Every person has intrinsic worth.
- Every person has something to contribute.
- Every person is responsible for her/his choices.
- Love, acceptance and a sense of belonging are essential for every person to flourish.
- A community which embraces shared ethics and diversity thrives.
- A community working together toward a common goal is fundamental to excellence.

Goals

Name	Development Status	Progress Status
All students will achieve proficiency in Science	Complete	Open
All students will achieve proficiency in Social Studies	Complete	Open
Math Proficiency	Complete	Open
Reading Goal	Complete	Open

Goal 1: All students will achieve proficiency in Science

Content Area: Science
Development Status: Complete

Student Goal Statement: All students will achieve proficiency in science.

Gap Statement: In reviewing the 2011 MEAP and MME data, we found the proficiency level of our students is well below the expected minimum proficiency level of 80%. Proficiency scores are the following for each grade level: 5th grade (29%), 8th grade (24%), and 11th grade (30.9%).

Discrepancy gaps are also significant between our economically disadvantaged students and non-economically disadvantaged students in science proficiency.

In 5th grade, 16% of the economically disadvantage students are proficient with 35% of non-economically disadvantaged students proficient.

In 8th grade, 10% of the economically disadvantaged students are proficient with 31% of non-economically disadvantaged students proficient.

In 11th grade, 19% of the economically disadvantaged are proficient with 35% of non-economically disadvantaged proficient.

The 2011 MEAP and MME data also indicate significant discrepancies between our students with disabilities and those without disabilities in science proficiency.

In 5th grade, 18% of students with disabilities are proficient and 30% without disabilities.

In 8th grade, 4% of students with disabilities are proficient and27% without disabilities.

In 11th grade, 0% of students with disabilities are proficient and 33% without disabilities.

Cause for Gap: Specific learning targets have not been identified for each grade level curriculum.
Lack of hands on learning to engage students.
Intervention strategies for at risk students are not being implemented.
Students struggle with informational reading and writing.
Curriculum needs to be reviewed.

More frequent assessments need to be used to identify struggling students.
Science teachers need more training on science lessons that incorporate more critical thinking.

Multiple measures/sources of data you used to identify this gap in student achievement: ITBS
Unit Common Assessments
MEAP
ACT/MME
Science Journals

What are the criteria for success and what data or multiple measures of assessment will be used to monitor progress and success of this goal? The criteria of success for the K - 11 level will be to decrease the gap by 15% as measured by the 2013 Fall science MEAP and MME Tests.

Contact Name: Pete VanKempen

List of Objectives:

Name	Objective
Science Proficiency	The percentage of all 5th grade students proficient on the MEAP in the area of basic science concepts will increase from 29% (Fall, 2011) to 40% (Fall, 2013). The percentage of economically disadvantaged 5th grade students proficient will increase from 16% (Fall, 2011) to 30% (Fall, 2013). The percentage of 5th grade students with disabilities proficient will increase from 18% (Fall, 2011) to 33% (Fall, 2013). The percentage of all 8th grade students proficient on the MEAP in the area of basic science concepts will increase from 24% (Fall, 2011) to 40% (Fall, 2013). The percentage of economically disadvantaged 8th grade students proficient on the MEAP will increase from 10% (Fall, 2011) to 25% (Fall, 2013). The percentage of 8th grade students with disabilities proficient will increase from 4% (Fall, 2011) to 20% (Fall, 2013). The percentage of all 11th grade students proficient on the MME in the area of basic science concepts will increase from 31% (Spring, 2010) to 46% (Spring, 2013). The percentage of economically disadvantaged 11th grade students proficient on the MME will increase from 19% (Spring, 2010) to 32% (Spring, 2013). The percentage of 11th grade students with disabilities proficient on the MME will increase from 0% (Spring, 2011) to 20% (Spring, 2013).

1.1. Objective: Science Proficiency

Measurable Objective Statement to Support Goal: The percentage of all 5th grade students proficient on the MEAP in the area of basic science concepts will increase from 29% (Fall, 2011) to 40% (Fall, 2013). The percentage of economically disadvantaged 5th grade students proficient will increase from 16% (Fall, 2011) to 30% (Fall, 2013). The percentage of 5th grade students with disabilities proficient will increase from 18% (Fall, 2011) to 33% (Fall, 2013).

The percentage of all 8th grade students proficient on the MEAP in the area of basic science concepts will increase from 24% (Fall, 2011) to 40% (Fall, 2013). The percentage of economically disadvantaged 8th grade students proficient on the MEAP will increase from 10% (Fall, 2011) to 25% (Fall, 2013). The percentage of 8th grade students with disabilities proficient will increase from 4% (Fall, 2011) to 20% (Fall, 2013).

The percentage of all 11th grade students proficient on the MME in the area of basic science concepts will increase from 31% (Spring, 2010) to 46% (Spring, 2013). The percentage of economically disadvantaged 11th grade students proficient on the MME will increase from 19% (Spring, 2010) to 32% (Spring, 2013). The percentage of 11th grade students with disabilities proficient on the MME will increase from 0% (Spring, 2011) to 20% (Spring, 2013).

List of Strategies:

Name	Strategy
PLC training	Teachers will participate in district monthly PLC meetings to discuss student data and CCSS curriculum in grades in grades K-12.
Science Proficiency	Teachers in grades 6-12 will receive professional development training in the area of the CCSS that address informational reading and writing practices as they pertain to science. Teachers in grades 1-5 will receive continuing training in informational writing as it pertains to the teaching of science.

1.1.1. Strategy: PLC training

Strategy Statement: Teachers will participate in district monthly PLC meetings to discuss student data and CCSS curriculum in grades in grades K-12.

Selected Target Areas

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

Rick DuFour and Bob Eaker's PLC strategies to improve student learning. Rick Stiggins works on formative and summative assessment data as incorporated into PLC meeting time.

List of Activities:

Activity	Begin Date	End Date	Staff Responsible
PLC training	2012-08-20	2013-08-20	Superintendent, building principals.

1.1.1.1. Activity: PLC training

Activity Type: Professional Development

Activity Description: Administrators and staff from from the K-12 buildings will attend training on Professional Learning Communities with an emphasis on data collection, disaggregation, and collaborative efforts to implement intervention lessons and support help in all core academic areas.

Planned staff responsible for implementing activity: Superintendent, building principals.

Actual staff responsible for implementing activity:

Planned Timeline: Begin Date - 2012-08-20, End Date - 2013-08-20

Actual Timeline: Begin Date - N/A, End Date - N/A

Fiscal Resources Needed for Activity:

Resource	Funding Source	Planned Amount	Actual Amount
professional learning communities training	Title II Part A	15,000.00	

1.1.2. Strategy: Science Proficiency

Strategy Statement: Teachers in grades 6-12 will receive professional development training in the area of the CCSS that address informational reading and writing practices as they pertain to science. Teachers in grades 1-5 will receive continuing training in informational writing as it pertains to the teaching of science.

Selected Target Areas

Indicator 8 In order to assure coherence across the entire system, district leaders have established a vision of powerful teaching and learning in collaboration with stakeholders. The district provides direction, assistance and resources to align, support, and enhance all parts of the system in seeking to successfully achieve this vision.

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

Classroom Instruction That Works: Research-Based Strategies for Increasing Student Achievement (2001) by Marzano, Pickering and Pollock.

List of Activities:

Activity	Begin Date	End Date	Staff Responsible
Effective Science Instruction	2011-07-01	2012-06-30	Ron Veldman, Pete VanKempen, Connie Wahr

1.1.2.1. Activity: Effective Science Instruction

Activity Description: Teachers will receive formal training that highlights hands-on learning, critical thinking, technology for differentiated learning style, and reflective writing responses. They will then meet with department colleagues to share best practices. Teachers will utilize the ELL handbook to work on techniques to enhance vocabulary aquisition for students who are English language learners. The schedule will be optimized for ELL amd Migrant students to receive maximum support. Suuplemental services include Dorie Creager, Marv Bergsma, Sally Alderink and Mary Bereza (Title III and IC).

Planned staff responsible for implementing activity: Ron Veldman, Pete VanKempen, Connie Wahr

Actual staff responsible for implementing activity:

Planned Timeline: Begin Date - 2011-07-01, End Date - 2012-06-30

Actual Timeline: Begin Date - N/A, End Date - N/A

Fiscal Resources Needed for Activity:

Resource	Funding Source	Planned Amount	Actual Amount
Training Fees and Sub Costs	General Funds	0.00	0.00

Goal 2: All students will achieve proficiency in Social Studies

Content Area: Social Studies
Development Status: Complete

Student Goal Statement: All students will achieve proficiency in social studies

Gap Statement: In reviewing the 2011 MEAP and MME assessment data, we found the proficiency level of our students is well below the expected minimum proficiency level of 80% for each grade level. Proficiency levels for each grade level are currently the following: grade 6 (36%) and grade 9 (45%).

It is also noted that significant discrepancy gaps are noted between the economically disadvantaged students and the non-economically disadvantaged students in social studies proficiency standards.

In 6th grade, 30% of our economically disadvantaged students are proficient with 40% of the non-economically disadvantaged students proficient.

In 9th grade,32% of our non-economically disadvantaged students are proficient with 52% of non-economically disadvantaged students proficient.

The 2011 MEAP and MME data results also indicate a significant discrepancy gap between students with disabilities and those without disabilities in the area of social studies.

In 6th grade, 16% of students with disabilities are proficient with 39% of students without disabilities proficient.

In 9th grade, 11% of students with disabilities are proficient with 48% of students without disabilities proficient.

Cause for Gap: The need for better curriculum alignment.
Grade level/course level learning targets need to be identified.
Students struggle with informational reading and writing skills as they apply to core areas.
Lack of intervention strategies for struggling students.
More frequent assessments need to happen to identify at risk students.
Teachers need more training on best practices to address the learning needs of all students.
Assessment alignment is needed.

Multiple measures/sources of data you used to identify this gap in student achievement: MEAP
Common district assessments
MME
ITBS

What are the criteria for success and what data or multiple measures of assessment will be used to monitor progress and success of this goal? The criteria of success for the K - 9 level will be to decrease the gap by 15% as measured by the 2013 Fall social studies MEAP Test. The criteria of success for the HS level will be to decrease the gap by 15% as measured by the 2013 social studies MME Test.

Contact Name: Ron Veldman

List of Objectives:

Name	Objective
Social Studies Proficiency For All	The percentage of all 6th grade students proficient on the MEAP in the area of general social studies concepts will increase from 37% (Fall, 2011) to 52% (Fall, 2013). The percentage of economically disadvantaged 6th grade students proficient on the MEAP will increase from 30% (Fall, 2011) to 45% (Fall, 2013). The percentage of 8th grade students with disabilities proficient on the MEAP will increase from 16% (Fall, 2011) to 30% (Fall, 2013). The percentage of all 9th grade students proficient on the MEAP in the area of general social studies concepts will increase from 45% (Fall, 2011) to 60% (Fall, 2013). The percentage of economically disadvantaged 9th grade students proficient on the MEAP will increase from 32% (Fall, 2011) to 47% (Fall, 2013). The percentage of 9th grade students with disabilities proficient on the MEAP will increase from 11% (Fall, 2011) to 25% (Fall, 2013).

2.1. Objective: Social Studies Proficiency For All

Measurable Objective Statement to Support Goal: The percentage of all 6th grade students proficient on the MEAP in the area of general social studies concepts will increase from 37% (Fall, 2011) to 52% (Fall, 2013). The percentage of economically disadvantaged 6th grade students proficient on the MEAP will increase from 30% (Fall, 2011) to 45% (Fall, 2013). The percentage of 8th grade students with disabilities proficient on the MEAP will increase from 16% (Fall, 2011) to 30% (Fall, 2013).

The percentage of all 9th grade students proficient on the MEAP in the area of general social studies concepts will increase from 45% (Fall, 2011) to 60% (Fall, 2013). The percentage of economically disadvantaged 9th grade students proficient on the MEAP will increase from 32% (Fall, 2011) to 47% (Fall, 2013). The

percentage of 9th grade students with disabilities proficient on the MEAP will increase from 11% (Fall, 2011) to 25% (Fall, 2013).

List of Strategies:

Name	Strategy
Effective Social Studies Instruction	Teachers in grades 6-12 will receive professional development training in the areas of the CCSS that address informational reading and writing strategies as they pertain to social studies. Teachers in grades 1-5 will receive continuing training in informational writing as it pertains to social studies.
PLC monthly meetings	Teachers will participate in district PLC monthly meetings to discuss student data and CCSS social studies curriculum in grades K-12.

2.1.1. Strategy: Effective Social Studies Instruction

Strategy Statement: Teachers in grades 6-12 will receive professional development training in the areas of the CCSS that address informational reading and writing strategies as they pertain to social studies. Teachers in grades 1-5 will receive continuing training in informational writing as it pertains to social studies.

Selected Target Areas

Indicator 8 In order to assure coherence across the entire system, district leaders have established a vision of powerful teaching and learning in collaboration with stakeholders. The district provides direction, assistance and resources to align, support, and enhance all parts of the system in seeking to successfully achieve this vision.

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

Classroom Instruction That Works: Research-Based Strategies for Increasing Student Achievement by Marzanno, Pickering and Pollock.

List of Activities:

Activity	Begin Date	End Date	Staff Responsible
Informational reading and writing	2012-08-20	2013-06-10	Superintendent, Peg Baker, building principals

2.1.1.1. Activity: Informational reading and writing

Activity Type: Professional Development

Activity Description: A literacy consultant will work with K-12 social studies teachers to train on common core informational reading and writing standards for instructional implementation.

Planned staff responsible for implementing activity: Superintendent, Peg Baker, building principals

Actual staff responsible for implementing activity: All classroom social studies teachers.

Planned Timeline: Begin Date - 2012-08-20, End Date - 2013-06-10

Actual Timeline: Begin Date - N/A, End Date - N/A

Fiscal Resources Needed for Activity:

Resource	Funding Source	Planned Amount	Actual Amount
Informational reading and writing training	Title II Part A	3,000.00	0.00

2.1.2. Strategy: PLC monthly meetings

Strategy Statement: Teachers will participate in district PLC monthly meetings to discuss student data and CCSS social studies curriculum in grades K-12.

Selected Target Areas

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

Rick DuFour and Bob Eaker's Professional Learning Community strategies. Rick Stiggins work on formative and summative assessments.

List of Activities:

Activity	Begin Date	End Date	Staff Responsible
Training on data disaggregation	2012-09-04	2013-06-10	PLC staff from K-12 buildings Peg Baker Ron Veldman Building principals Professional Development Coach

2.1.2.1. Activity: Training on data disaggregation

Activity Type: Professional Development

Activity Description: PLC K-12 teacher teams will receive training on data disaggregation as it pertains to identifying at risk students who are struggling with passing common core standards.

Planned staff responsible for implementing activity: PLC staff from K-12 buildings
Peg Baker
Ron Veldman
Building principals
Professional Development Coach

Actual staff responsible for implementing activity:

Planned Timeline: Begin Date - 2012-09-04, End Date - 2013-06-10

Actual Timeline: Begin Date - N/A, End Date - N/A

Fiscal Resources Needed for Activity:

Resource	Funding Source	Planned Amount	Actual Amount
Data training	General Funds	0.00	

Goal 3: Math Proficiency

Content Area: Math
Development Status: Complete

Student Goal Statement: All students will be proficient in math.

Gap Statement: In reviewing the 2011 MEAP and MME data, we found that the proficiency level of our students is well below the expected proficiency level of a minimum proficiency level of 80%. Proficiency levels for each grade level are the following: grade 3 (34%), grade 4 (48%), grade 5 (40%), grade 6 (41%), grade 7 (49%), grade 8 (41%), and grade 11 (35%).

Discrepancy gaps are significant between our economically disadvantaged and non-economically disadvantaged in math proficiency.

In third grade, 24% of our economically disadvantaged students are proficient with 39% of non-economically disadvantaged students proficient.

In seventh grade, 34% of our economically disadvantaged students are proficient with 56% of non-economically disadvantaged students proficient.

In eleventh grade, 19% of our economically disadvantaged students are proficient with 40.5% of non-economically disadvantaged students proficient.

The 2011 MEAP and MME data results also indicate alarming discrepancies between our students with disabilities and those students without in the area of math proficiency particularly at the middle school and high

school levels.

In 3rd grade, 21% of students with disabilities are proficient and 36% of students without disabilities,

In 5th grade, 31% of students with disabilities are proficient and 42% of students without disabilities.

In 7th grade, 12% of students with disabilities are proficient and 53% of students without disabilities.

In 11th grade, 0% of students with disabilities are proficient and 37.9% of students without disabilities.

Cause for Gap: Common core standards are not embedded into daily instruction in grades K-12.

District common assessments are not consistently used and reviewed by grade/course level teachers.

Lack of teacher training on best practices in mathematics instruction.

Math intervention and support services are not available at the middle school level.

Classroom teachers are not trained on working with at risk math students.

Lack off formative assessments to measure growth at more frequent intervals.

Lack of data disaggregation at the secondary level.

Multiple measures/sources of data you used to identify this gap in student achievement: Delta Math Screener
MEAP
MME/ACT/PLAN/EXPLORE
ITBS
Unit common assessments

What are the criteria for success and what data or multiple measures of assessment will be used to monitor progress and success of this goal? The criteria of success for the K - 8 level will be to decrease the gap by 10% as measured by the 2013 Fall MEAP Test.

Likewise, The disparity gap for the HS Juniors will be reduced by 10% as measured 2013 Spring MME Test.

Contact Name: Lyndsey Kosten

List of Objectives:

Name	Objective
Math Proficiency for all students	The percentage of all 3rd grade students proficient on the MEAP in the area of foundational math skills will increase from 34% (Fall, 2011) to 49%(Fall, 2013). The percentage of 3rd grade students who are economically disadvantaged will increase in proficiency from 24% (Fall, 2011) to 40% (Fall, 2013). The percentage of 3rd grade students with disabilities will increase in proficiency from 21% (Fall, 2011) to 36% (Fall, 2013). The percentage of all 7th grade students proficient on the MEAP in the area of foundational math skills will increase from 49% (Fall, 2011) to 64% (Fall, 2013). The percentage of 7th grade students who are economically disadvantaged will increase in

	proficiency from 34% (Fall, 2011) to 50% (Fall, 2013). The percentage of 7th grade students with disabilities will increase in proficiency from 12% (Fall, 2011) to 30% (Fall, 2013). The percentage of all 11th grade students proficient on the MME in the area of overall math skills will increase from 35% (Spring, 2010) to 50% (Spring, 2013). The percentage of 11th grade students who are economically disadvantaged will increase in proficiency from 19% (Spring, 2010) to 35% (Spring, 2013). The percentage of 11th grade students with disabilities will increase in proficiency from 0% (Spring, 2010) to 20% (Spring, 2013).

3.1. Objective: Math Proficiency for all students

Measurable Objective Statement to Support Goal: The percentage of all 3rd grade students proficient on the MEAP in the area of foundational math skills will increase from 34% (Fall, 2011) to 49%(Fall, 2013). The percentage of 3rd grade students who are economically disadvantaged will increase in proficiency from 24% (Fall, 2011) to 40% (Fall, 2013). The percentage of 3rd grade students with disabilities will increase in proficiency from 21% (Fall, 2011) to 36% (Fall, 2013).

The percentage of all 7th grade students proficient on the MEAP in the area of foundational math skills will increase from 49% (Fall, 2011) to 64% (Fall, 2013). The percentage of 7th grade students who are economically disadvantaged will increase in proficiency from 34% (Fall, 2011) to 50% (Fall, 2013). The percentage of 7th grade students with disabilities will increase in proficiency from 12% (Fall, 2011) to 30% (Fall, 2013).

The percentage of all 11th grade students proficient on the MME in the area of overall math skills will increase from 35% (Spring, 2010) to 50% (Spring, 2013). The percentage of 11th grade students who are economically disadvantaged will increase in proficiency from 19% (Spring, 2010) to 35% (Spring, 2013). The percentage of 11th grade students with disabilities will increase in proficiency from 0% (Spring, 2010) to 20% (Spring, 2013).

List of Strategies:

Name	Strategy
math support teacher	A middle school math support teacher will be trained to work with identified at-risk math students on differentiating math lessons on the common core standards and embedding hands on and tech software lessons to help with the learning process.
Parapro math support	Paraprofessionals will work with eligible Title I and 31A students as directed by classroom teachers in grades K-5 to provide intervention strategies.
PLC training	Teachers in grades K-12 will be trained in PLC processes to better monitor student progress in the area of general mathematics.
Targeted Math Differentiation	Teachers will be trained in implementing common core math standards into daily lessons, data collection, and interventions for at risk students.

3.1.1. Strategy: math support teacher

Strategy Statement: A middle school math support teacher will be trained to work with identified at-risk math students on differentiating math lessons on the common core standards and embedding hands on and tech software lessons to help with the learning process.

Selected Target Areas

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

Mike Mattos work on Response To Intervention.

List of Activities:

Activity	Begin Date	End Date	Staff Responsible
Middle Schoo Math Support Teacher	2012-09-04	2013-06-10	Middle school math support teacher Middle school principal Peg Baker

3.1.1.1. Activity: Middle Schoo Math Support Teacher

Activity Type: Other

Activity Description: A middle school math support teacher will provide intervention instructional practices for the common core math standards for students in grades 6-8 who are identified through 31A criteria as at risk students.

Planned staff responsible for implementing activity: Middle school math support teacher
Middle school principal
Peg Baker

Actual staff responsible for implementing activity:

Planned Timeline: Begin Date - 2012-09-04, End Date - 2013-06-10

Actual Timeline: Begin Date - N/A, End Date - N/A

Fiscal Resources Needed for Activity:

Resource	Funding Source	Planned Amount	Actual Amount
Middle Schoo Math Support Teacher	Section 31 a	110,968.00	

3.1.2. Strategy: Parapro math support

Strategy Statement: Paraprofessionals will work with eligible Title I and 31A students as directed by classroom teachers in grades K-5 to provide intervention strategies.

Selected Target Areas

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

Mike Mattos work on tier II and tier III academic support services.

List of Activities:

Activity	Begin Date	End Date	Staff Responsible
Parapro math support	2012-09-04	2013-06-10	Building principals Peg Baker

3.1.2.1. Activity: Parapro math support

Activity Type: Professional Development

Activity Description: Paraprofessionals working with eligible Title I and 31A students in math support will attend the ISD training on math curriculum and intervention strategies.

Planned staff responsible for implementing activity: Building principals
Peg Baker

Actual staff responsible for implementing activity:

Planned Timeline: Begin Date - 2012-09-04, End Date - 2013-06-10

Actual Timeline: Begin Date - N/A, End Date - N/A

Fiscal Resources Needed for Activity:

Resource	Funding Source	Planned Amount	Actual Amount
parapro math support	Title I Part A	206,876.00	

3.1.3. Strategy: PLC training

Strategy Statement: Teachers in grades K-12 will be trained in PLC processes to better monitor student progress in the area of general mathematics.

Selected Target Areas

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

Rick DuFour and Bob Eaker's work on Professional Learning Communities.

List of Activities:

Activity	Begin Date	End Date	Staff Responsible
PLC training	2012-08-20	2013-08-22	Superintendent PD trainers Building principals

3.1.3.1. Activity: PLC training

Activity Type: Professional Development

Activity Description: Administrators and PLC teacher leaders will be trained on implementing a viable common core math curriculum, identifying the critical assessments, and data disaggregation to inform instruction.

Planned staff responsible for implementing activity: Superintendent
PD trainers
Building principals

Actual staff responsible for implementing activity:

Planned Timeline: Begin Date - 2012-08-20, End Date - 2013-08-22

Actual Timeline: Begin Date - N/A, End Date - N/A

Fiscal Resources Needed for Activity:

Resource	Funding Source	Planned Amount	Actual Amount
PLC training	Title II Part A	15,000.00	

3.1.4. Strategy: Targeted Math Differentiation

Strategy Statement: Teachers will be trained in implementing common core math standards into daily lessons, data collection, and interventions for at risk students.

Selected Target Areas

Indicator 1 The written curriculum incorporates the district's expectations for good instruction and essential content and affirms a common vision and understanding of the learning standards under which the district operates. Based on state standards, it is structured around a set of interrelated programs for students and staff, guided by a common framework, and pursued over a sustained period of time. The curriculum reflects a commitment to equity and diversity and its flexibility is designed to address the wide range of needs and abilities of all students.

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

Bpb Marzano's work on The Art of Teaching.

List of Activities:

Activity	Begin Date	End Date	Staff Responsible
Differentiation lesson training	2012-09-04	2013-06-10	Mindy Plank, Peg Baker, Katie Cutshall, Lyndsey Kosten, and Stacey Goodwin.

3.1.4.1. Activity: Differentiation lesson training

Activity Type: Professional Development

Activity Description: Grade level and department staff will be trained on creating and developing differentiated SMART lessons and assessments for targeted populations of students.

Planned staff responsible for implementing activity: Mindy Plank, Peg Baker, Katie Cutshall, Lyndsey Kosten, and Stacey Goodwin.

Actual staff responsible for implementing activity: Peg Baker
Professional Development Coach
Building principal

Planned Timeline: Begin Date - 2012-09-04, End Date - 2013-06-10

Actual Timeline: Begin Date - N/A, End Date - N/A

Fiscal Resources Needed for Activity:

Resource	Funding Source	Planned Amount	Actual Amount
Differentiation lesson training	Title II Part A	3,000.00	0.00

Goal 4: Reading Goal

Content Area: English Language Arts
Development Status: Complete

Student Goal Statement: All students will achieve proficiency in the area of reading skills.

Gap Statement: *On the 2011 MEAP and MME reading assessment, it was recognized that the proficiency level attained by all students declined from 77% at the third grade level to 66% at the eighth grade level. This has been a trend over the last five years. In grades 3-11, there are significant gaps between the economically disadvantaged and the non-economically disadvantage.

In 3rd grade, @68% of the economically disadvantaged students are proficient with 82% of the non-economically disadvantaged proficient in reading.

In 5th grade, 72% of the economically disadvantaged students are proficient with 82% of the non-economically disadvantaged proficient in reading.

In 7th grade, 48% of the economically disadvantaged students are proficient with 76% of the non-economically disadvantaged proficient in reading.

In 11th grade, 46.8% of the economically disadvantaged students are proficient with 61.7% of the non-economically disadvantaged proficient in reading.

There is also a significant gap noted from the 2011 MEAP and MME results between students with disabilities and students without disabilities in proficiency performance in the area of reading.

In 3rd grade, students with disabilities were 43% proficient with students without disabilities performing at a 82% proficiency rate.

In 5th grade, students with disabilities were 59% proficient with students without disabilities performing at a 81% proficiency rate.

In 7th grade, students with disabilities were 18% proficient with students without disabilities performing at a 71% proficiency rate.

In 11th grade, students with disabilities were 14.3% proficient with students without disabilities performing at a 61.5% proficiency rate.

Cause for Gap: Reading instructional practices need to be reviewed in grades K-2.

Lack of reading support services in the middle school.

Reading program and assessments are not fully aligned with the common core standards.

There is a need for effective strategies for the economically disadvantaged students.

There is a need for effective strategies for students with disabilities.

More formative assessments and learning need to be implemented to assess students at more frequent intervals.

Training on best practices in reading instruction needs to happen K-12.

Learning targets have not been entirely identified and documented for all English classes.

Multiple measures/sources of data you used to identify this gap in student achievement: Lexile scores
ITBS
Common Reading Assessments
MEAP
Unit Reading Tests
MME
ACT
EXPLOE
PLAN
DIBELS

What are the criteria for success and what data or multiple measures of assessment will be used to monitor progress and success of this goal? The criteria of success for the K - 8 level will be to decrease the gap by 15% as measured by the 2013 Fall Reading MEAP Test.

Likewise, the disparity gap for the HS Juniors will be reduced by 15% as measured 2013 Spring Reading MME Test.

Contact Name: Margaret Baker

List of Objectives:

Name	Objective
Reading Proficiency for all students	The percentage of economically disadvantaged 3rd grade students proficient on the MEAP in the area of foundational reading skills will increase from 68% (Fall, 2011) to 80% (Fall, 2013). The percentage of 3rd grade students with disabilities proficient on the MEAP will increase from 43% (Fall, 2011) to 58% (Fall, 2013). The percentage of economically disadvantaged 5th grade students proficient on the MEAP in the area of foundational reading skills will increase from 72% (Fall, 2011) to 82% (Fall, 2013). The percentage of 5th grade students with disabilities proficient on the MEAP will increase from 59% (Fall, 2011) to 64% (Fall, 2013). The percentage of economically disadvantaged 7th grade students proficient on the MEAP in the areas of foundational reading skills will increase from 48% (Fall, 2011) to 63% (Fall, 2013). The percentage of 7th grade students with disabilities proficient on the MEAP will increase from 18% (Fall, 2011) to 33% (Fall, 2013). The percentage of economically disadvantaged 11th grade students proficient on the MME in the area of foundational reading skills will increase from 46% (Spring, 2010) to 61% (Spring, 2013). The

	percentage of 11th grade students with disabilities proficient on the MME will increase from 14% (Spring, 2010) to 20% (Spring, 2013).

4.1. Objective: Reading Proficiency for all students

Measurable Objective Statement to Support Goal: The percentage of economically disadvantaged 3rd grade students proficient on the MEAP in the area of foundational reading skills will increase from 68% (Fall, 2011) to 80% (Fall, 2013). The percentage of 3rd grade students with disabilities proficient on the MEAP will increase from 43% (Fall, 2011) to 58% (Fall, 2013).

The percentage of economically disadvantaged 5th grade students proficient on the MEAP in the area of foundational reading skills will increase from 72% (Fall, 2011) to 82% (Fall, 2013). The percentage of 5th grade students with disabilities proficient on the MEAP will increase from 59% (Fall, 2011) to 64% (Fall, 2013).

The percentage of economically disadvantaged 7th grade students proficient on the MEAP in the areas of foundational reading skills will increase from 48% (Fall, 2011) to 63% (Fall, 2013). The percentage of 7th grade students with disabilities proficient on the MEAP will increase from 18% (Fall, 2011) to 33% (Fall, 2013).

The percentage of economically disadvantaged 11th grade students proficient on the MME in the area of foundational reading skills will increase from 46% (Spring, 2010) to 61% (Spring, 2013). The percentage of 11th grade students with disabilities proficient on the MME will increase from 14% (Spring, 2010) to 20% (Spring, 2013).

List of Strategies:

Name	Strategy
common core training	Teachers in grades 1-12 will be trained in incorporating common core reading standards into all subject areas.
middle school reading support teacher	A middle school reading support teacher will be trained to work with eligible at-risk students on common core reading skills.
Parapro reading support	Paraprofessionals will work with eligible Title I and 31A students in the area of reading support as directed by classroom teachers in grades K-5.

4.1.1. Strategy: common core training

Strategy Statement: Teachers in grades 1-12 will be trained in incorporating common core reading standards into all subject areas.

Selected Target Areas

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

Bob Marzano's work on Classroom Instruction That Works.

List of Activities:

Activity	Begin Date	End Date	Staff Responsible
Common Core training for Reading standards	2012-09-04	2013-06-10	CCSS trainer Building principals Peg Baker PLC teacher leaders
Lexia Software Implementation	2012-09-04	2013-06-10	principal Classroom teachers in grades 3-5 Title I teacher
Parapro reading support	2012-09-04	2013-06-10	Building principals Peg Baker

4.1.1.1. Activity: Common Core training for Reading standards

Activity Type: Professional Development

Activity Description: Common core reading training will be provided for all core academic teachers in grades K-12 to implement new standards on informational reading.

Planned staff responsible for implementing activity: CCSS trainer
Building principals
Peg Baker
PLC teacher leaders

Actual staff responsible for implementing activity:

Planned Timeline: Begin Date - 2012-09-04, End Date - 2013-06-10

Actual Timeline: Begin Date - N/A, End Date - N/A

Fiscal Resources Needed for Activity:

Resource	Funding Source	Planned Amount	Actual Amount
CCSS training for reading	Title II Part A	3,000.00	

4.1.1.2. Activity: Lexia Software Implementation

Activity Type: Technology

Activity Description: Classroom teachers and parapro support staff will implement the use of the Lexia Software program as a Tier II intervention for eligible Title I students.

Planned staff responsible for implementing activity: principal
Classroom teachers in grades 3-5
Title I teacher

Actual staff responsible for implementing activity:

Planned Timeline: Begin Date - 2012-09-04, End Date - 2013-06-10

Actual Timeline: Begin Date - N/A, End Date - N/A

Fiscal Resources Needed for Activity:

Resource	Funding Source	Planned Amount	Actual Amount
Lexia software program	Title I Part A	3,239.00	

4.1.1.3. Activity: Parapro reading support

Activity Type: Professional Development

Activity Description: Paraprofessionals will be trained along side classroom teachers on reading standards and intervention strategies by the ISD consultant, Dawn Heerema (trainer on intervention and reading assessments), and the district professional development coach.

Planned staff responsible for implementing activity: Building principals
Peg Baker

Actual staff responsible for implementing activity:

Planned Timeline: Begin Date - 2012-09-04, End Date - 2013-06-10

Actual Timeline: Begin Date - N/A, End Date - N/A

Fiscal Resources Needed for Activity:

Resource	Funding Source	Planned Amount	Actual Amount
parapro reading support	Title I Part A	206,876.00	

4.1.2. Strategy: middle school reading support teacher

Strategy Statement: A middle school reading support teacher will be trained to work with eligible at-risk students on common core reading skills.

Selected Target Areas

Indicator 10 The district holds all adults accountable for student learning and the attainment of high standards. Productive relationships are developed with all stakeholders and leadership is distributed across these stakeholder groups. Therefore, the district expects individuals to be accountable for their contributions to the collective result.

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

Penny Kittle on Reading Workshop Instruction for middle school students.

List of Activities:

Activity	Begin Date	End Date	Staff Responsible
Tracking ELA	2011-07-01	2012-06-30	Marty Alexander, Ron Veldman, Janine Goosen, Rose Weiten, Kathy Levandoski
Training for middle school reading support teacher	2012-08-15	2013-06-30	Middle school reading support teacher Peg Baker Middle school principal

4.1.2.1. Activity: Tracking ELA

Activity Description: Meet as part of RTI to track student performance and responsibilities.

Teachers will work together by grade level and develop SMART lessons that differentiate instruction for language arts.

Teachers (1-5) will train on and implement lexia/phonics program for tier 2 intervention.

Lower el teachers will work with a Literacy Coach to improve basic phonics instruction.

Teachers will utilize the ELL handbook to work on techniques to enhance vocabulary aquisition for students who are English language learners.

The schedule will be optimized for ELL amd Migrant students to receive maximum support.

Supplemental services include Sally Alderink and Mart Bereza (Title II and IC), HQ Paraprofessionals, Janine Goosen and Rose Weiten (Title and 31a Reading Teachers), The Literacy Coach for lower el, The

purchase of the Lexia program and the trainer of the Lexia program.

Planned staff responsible for implementing activity: Marty Alexander, Ron Veldman, Janine Goosen, Rose Weiten, Kathy Levandoski

Actual staff responsible for implementing activity:

Planned Timeline: Begin Date - 2011-07-01, End Date - 2012-06-30

Actual Timeline: Begin Date - N/A, End Date - N/A

Fiscal Resources Needed for Activity:

Resource	Funding Source	Planned Amount	Actual Amount
Middle school reading support teacher	Section 31 a	80,218.00	0.00

4.1.2.2. Activity: Training for middle school reading support teacher

Activity Type: Professional Development

Activity Description: The middle school reading support teacher will be trained on reading strategies, intervention lessons, and reading assessment tools to work with identified at risk students through 31A criteria.

Planned staff responsible for implementing activity: Middle school reading support teacher
Peg Baker
Middle school principal

Actual staff responsible for implementing activity: Middle school reading support teacher
Peg Baker
Middle school principal

Planned Timeline: Begin Date - 2012-08-15, End Date - 2013-06-30

Actual Timeline: Begin Date - N/A, End Date - N/A

Fiscal Resources Needed for Activity:

Resource	Funding Source	Planned Amount	Actual Amount
School Improvement Chair Training	General Funds	515.00	0.00

4.1.3. Strategy: Parapro reading support

Strategy Statement: Paraprofessionals will work with eligible Title I and 31A students in the area of reading support as directed by classroom teachers in grades K-5.

Selected Target Areas

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

Mike Mattos who addresses the importance of appropriate interventions for students at tier II and tier III support needs.

List of Activities:

Activity	Begin Date	End Date	Staff Responsible
parapro reading support	2012-09-04	2013-06-10	Building principals Peg Baker Professional Development Coach

4.1.3.1. Activity: parapro reading support

Activity Type: Professional Development

Activity Description: Paraprofessionals will be required to attend training along with the classroom teachers on reading interventions and assessments in order to better support Title I and 31A students in the area of informational reading and reading strategies.

Planned staff responsible for implementing activity: Building principals
Peg Baker
Professional Development Coach

Actual staff responsible for implementing activity:

Planned Timeline: Begin Date - 2012-09-04, End Date - 2013-06-10

Actual Timeline: Begin Date - N/A, End Date - N/A

Fiscal Resources Needed for Activity:

Resource	Funding Source	Planned Amount	Actual Amount

Resource Profile

Funding Source	Planned Amount	Actual Amount
Title I Part A	$416,991.00	$0.00
Section 31 a	$191,186.00	$0.00
General Funds	$515.00	$0.00
Title II Part A	$39,000.00	$0.00

Assurances

Special Education

1. The District School Improvement Team reviews the CIMS data.

   Response: *Yes*
   Comments:

2. CIMS data is used to prepare the District Improvement Plan.

   Response: *Yes*
   Comments:

Technology

1. The District Technology Protection Measure blocks or filters adult and student internet access to inappropriate materials (visual depictions that are obscene, child pornography, or harmful to minors).

   Response: *Yes*
   Comments: *Provided by our ISD.*

2. The district has a process to monitor adult and student use of the internet.

   Response: *Yes*
   Comments:

3. The district has an Internet Safety Policy in place.

   Response: *Yes*
   Comments: *Procedures in place following our policy.*

4. The Internet Safety Policy meets the requirements as outlined in the state Technology Planning and CIPA requirements.

   Response: *Yes*
   Comments:

5. The district has a process to provide public notice and hearings about the Internet Safety Policy.

   Response: *Yes*

Comments:

6. The district uses school-wide assessments to determine the telecommunication services and hardware support that are needed to support teaching and learning in all schools.

   Response: *Yes*
   Comments: *Use technology assessments to determine needs and future planning.*

7. The district uses the school-wide assessment data to identify the needs of the schools in the following areas: infrastructure (wiring, internet connections T1, etc.) in all classrooms, in all labs, in all media centers, in the main office, in counseling offices, in support staff offices; hardware; software; professional development. If "yes", specify the needs in the comments section.

   Response: *Yes*
   Comments: *Currently have wireless access in our middle school and high school. Use assessments to determine professional development and training needs.*

8. The district has identified specific actions that promote curriculum and teaching strategies to effectively integrate technology. If "yes", specify the actions in the comments section.

   Response: *Yes*
   Comments: *Training in differentiated instruction and response systems to procide formative feedback to staff.*

9. The district adjusts its curriculum to include technology literacy for all students.

   Response: *Yes*
   Comments:

10. The district adjusts its instructional program to promote technology literacy. If "yes", specify the adjustments in the comments section.

    Response: *Yes*
    Comments: *Provide additional high school classes as well as training for staff in Moodle and other software applications to develop blended instruction in teaching/learning environment.*

Stakeholders

List of names, positions and e-mail addresses 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.

Title	First Name	Last Name	Position	E-mail
Mr.	Ron	Veldman	Superintendent/parent	rveldman@coopersville.k12.mi.us
Mr.	Marty	Alexander	Principal	MAlexander@coopersvile.k12.mi.us
Mr.	Ryan	Pfahler	Principal	rpfahler@coopersville.k12.mi.us
Mr.	Pete	Bush	Principal, parent	pbush@coopersville.k12.mi.us
Ms.	Stacey	Goodwin	technology coordinator	SGoodwin@coopersville.k12.mi.us
Ms.	Tammi	Jenkins	teacher, parent	tjenkins@coopersville.k12.mi.us
Ms.	Katie	Cutshall	teacher	KWinsemius@coopersville.k12.mi.us
Mr.	Pete	VanKempen	parent, teacher	PVankempen@coopersville.k12.mi.us
Ms.	Stefanie	Clemence	teacher	SClemence@coopersville.k12.mi.us
Mr.	Lynn	VanSickle	Board Member, parent	LVanSickle@coopersville.k12.mi.us
Ms.	Lisa	Barkel	Title I Parent	LBarkel@verizon.com
Mrs.	Marie	DeGroot	Principl	mdegroot@coopersville.k12.mi.us

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

The district stakeholders meet regularly throughout the year. The fall of the year focusses on monitorring and and evaluation of the current plan. This involves data analysis and evaluation of current needs and professional devleopment. The work changes to planning/design/modifications of the current plan as well as working through building school improvement teams and decisions on professional development and training.

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

Our institution has a process in place which serves as the major component of addressing curriculum, instruction, and assessment decisions. The District Coordinating Council for Education meets monthly as a whole group to address curriculum issues/problems; examine methods, materials, and staff development options; recommend to the Superintendent research-based and consensus-supported solutions for implementation. Ad-hoc subcommittees also work regularly and report back to the D.C.C.E.

3. Describe how institution and student information and progress will be shared with all stakeholders in a language that they can understand.

Information and progress is shared regularly through meetings where data from our data warehouse system tracks student information and progress. Analysis of this information is used at a district wide level but also within each building school improvement team. In addition informaiton is shared through district publications and web sites.

Statement of Non-Discrimination

Federal Office for Civil Rights

The institution 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.

Contact Information

Schools/Districts are required to designate an employee to coordinate efforts to comply with and carry out non-discrimination responsibilities.

Name/Position:	Coopersville Area Public Schools Office of Human Resources
Address:	198 East Street Coopersville MI 49404
Telephone Number:	(616) 997-3200

References

- Title VI of the Civil Rights Act of 1964
- The Age Discrimination Act of 1975
- The Americans with Disabilities Act of 1990
- Elliott-Larsen prohibits discrimination against religion

Supporting Documentation

The following documentation was attached. These are appended to this PDF and will display in the following pages:

- District Board Policy on Parent Involvement

Conclusion

1. What Professional Learning activities will you need to provide to support the successful implementation of this school improvement plan?

We will work to continue to provide PLC time for our staff to work together in groups to address the various goals at the district and building level. We will work to ensure vertical and horizontal alignment in the work to address the various actions. We will also provide time for specific inititiatives involving training and work with our staff to meet our objectives.

2. How has the institution integrated its available fiscal resources to support this school improvement plan?

Our plan involves an integrated process used to identify areas of improvement after compilation and review of data. We work collaboratively in administrative and school improvement meetings to help refine the actions and target how our limited fiscal resources are spent to provide the best value for our dollar in regards to helping our students achieve. We then review the impact and evaluate the next steps in our continuous improvement planning process.

3. How has the institution assessed the need for and integrated the use of technology to support this school improvement plan?

The district has incorporated audiovisual equipment in the 141 class rooms which provides an interactive white board, amplified sound, document camera, and DVD player. We also have a one-to-one laptop initiative in grades 6-11.

We provide the staff with training in the summer and ongoing training and support through the school year to help support their efforts. Our goal is to differentiate instruction and teach to a variety of learning styles for the purpose of gains in achievement. By varying the instruction and providing reteaching opportunities, we work to address the needs of all learners.

The Board of Education recognizes and values parents and families as children's first teachers and decision-makers in education. The Board believes that student learning is more likely to occur when there is an effective partnership between the school and the student's parents and family. Such a partnership between the home and school and greater involvement of parents in the education of their children generally result in higher academic achievement, improved student behavior, and reduced absenteeism.

The term "families" is used in order to include children's primary caregivers, who are not their biological parents, such as foster caregivers, grandparents, and other family members.

Through this policy, the Board directs the establishment of a Parental Involvement Plan by which a school-partnership can be established and provided to the parent of each child in the District. The plan must encompass parent participation, through meetings and other forms of communication. The Parental Involvement Plan shall reflect the Board's commitment to the following:

A. **Relationships with Families**

( ) Cultivating school environments that are welcoming, supportive, and student-centered; [4]

( ) Providing professional development for school staff that helps build partnerships between families and schools; [2,3,4]

( ) Providing family activities that relate to various cultures, languages, practices, and customs, and bridge economic and cultural barriers; [2,3]

( ) Providing coordination, technical support and other support to assist schools in planning and implementing family involvement activities. [3]

B. **Effective Communication**

( ) Providing information to families to support the proper health, safety, and well-being of their children;

( ) Providing information to families about school policies, procedures, programs, and activities; [2,3,4]

( ) Promoting regular and open communication between school personnel and students' family members; [1,4]

( ) Communicating with families in a format and language that is understandable, to the extent practicable; [2,3]

( ) Providing information and involving families in monitoring student progress; [3]

( ) Providing families with timely and meaningful information regarding Michigan's academic standards, State and local assessments, and pertinent legal provisions; [2,3,4]

( ) Preparing families to be involved in meaningful discussions and meetings with school staff. [2,3,4]

C. **Volunteer Opportunities**

( ) Providing volunteer opportunities for families to support their children's school activities; [1,3]

( ) Supporting other needs, such as transportation and child care, to enable families to participate in school-sponsored family involvement events. [3,4]

D. **Learning at Home**

( ) Offering training and resources to help families learn strategies and skills to support at-home learning and success in school; [1,2,3,4]

( ) Working with families to establish learning goals and help their children accomplish these goals; [1]

( ) Helping families to provide a school and home environment that encourages learning and extends learning at home. [1,2,4]

E. **Involving Families in Decision Making and Advocacy**

( ) Involving families as partners in the process of school review and continuous improvement planning; [3,4]

( ) Involving families in the development of its District-wide parent involvement policy and plan, and distributing the policy and plan to families. [2,3,4]

F. **Collaborating with the Community**

( ) Building constructive partnerships and connecting families with community-based programs and other community resources; [2,3,4]

( ) Coordinating and integrating family involvement programs and activities with District initiatives and community-based programs that encourage and support families' participation in their children's education, growth, and development. [2,3,4]

Implementation

The Superintendent will provide for a comprehensive plan to engage parents, families, and community members in a partnership in support of each student's academic achievement, the District's continuous improvement, and individual school improvement plans. The plan will be distributed to all parents and students through publication in the Student Handbook or other suitable means. The plan will provide for annual evaluation, with the involvement of parents and families, of the plan's effectiveness and identification of barriers to participation by parents and families. Evaluation findings will be used in the annual review of the Parent and Family Involvement policy and to improve the effectiveness of the District plan. Action steps by individual buildings will be initiated from evaluation findings regarding areas of improvement.

Migrant Education Program (MEP) Parent(s)/Guardian(s) Involvement

Parent(s)/Guardian(s) of students in the MEP will be involved in, and regularly consulted, about the development, implementation, operation, and evaluation of the program.

Limited English Proficiency (LEP) Parent(s)/Guardian(s) Involvement

In accordance with federal law, parent(s)/guardian(s) of LEP students will be provided notice regarding their child’s placement in and information about the District’s LEP program. Parent(s)/Guardian(s) will be notified about their rights regarding program content and participation including the right to choose among programs if alternatives are available. The notice must also include an explanation of the value of the program in terms of academic development, mastery of English, and the achievement of promotion and graduation standards. The notice will also include an explanation of the right to remove the child from an LEP program and to place the child in the regular program.

The notice must be in a format that families can comprehend and, if possible, in a language that is understood by the family.

Approved:
LEGAL REF: MCL 380.1294; Sec. 1112, 1118 ESEA

[1]Indicates State Requirements
[2]Indicates IDEA 2004 Section 650 & 644 parent involvement requirements
[3]Indicates Title I Section 1118 parent involvement requirements
[4]Indicates State Board Parent and Family Involvement Policy recommendations

[NOTE: Districts should select all ( ) options included in this template in order to have a policy that meets the requirements of State and Federal law and program requirements of Title I.]