

School Improvement Plan

School Year: 2010

School District: Northville Public Schools

Intermediate School District: Wayne RESA

School Name: Amerman Elementary School

Grades Served: K,1,2,3,4,5

Principal: Dr. Stephen A Anderson

Building Code: 00083

District Approval of Plan:

Authorized Official Signature and Date

Board of Education Approval of Plan:

Authorized Official Signature and Date

School Improvement Plan

Contents

Introduction	3
School Information	5
Vision	6
Goals	8
Goal 1: Goal #1-Reading	8
Goal 2: Goal #2- Mathematics	16
Goal 3: Goal 3- Spelling	26
Resource Profile	35
Title I Required Components	36
Stakeholders	37
Statement of Non-Discrimination	40
Conclusion	41

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 **School Improvement Plan template (SIP)** 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

School Information

School:	Amerman Elementary School
District:	Northville Public Schools
Public/Non-Public:	Public
Grades:	K,1,2,3,4,5
School Code Number:	00083
City:	Northville
State/Province:	Michigan
Country:	United States

Vision

Vision Statement

The Northville Public Schools, in partnership with the family and the community, shares a responsibility to develop young people who are independent and responsible citizens. The District is dedicated to providing a quality education for all students. Programs and curriculum will be research-backed and based on the needs and abilities of students. Staff will challenge students to achieve their individual capacities. In support of this purpose, the district will strive to create a positive educational environment, to employ qualified and caring personnel, and to provide sufficient and relevant learning materials. Our goal is to help each Northville Public School student become a graduate with a mastery of core knowledge and skills to become an:

Analytic Thinker

who is a resourceful individual who uses core knowledge to process and manage information to solve problems.

Effective Communicator

who comprehends and expresses ideas clearly through various means of communication.

Quality Contributor

who continually seeks to achieve quality results through individual accountability, leadership and /or teamwork using multiple methods, technologies and resources.

Continuous Learner

who improves self through life-long learning with a sense of confidence to adapt to change, set, and achieve goals.

World Class Citizen

who is responsible to self, others and the environment as a contributing member of a democratic society in a diverse world.

Board of Education Policy #1100

Mission Statement

In partnership with students, staff, parents, and community, the mission of Amerman Elementary School is for all students to learn well and succeed in the areas of academics, the arts, physical development, social awareness, and responsible decision making.

Beliefs Statement

BELIEF STATEMENT

At Amerman Elementary School we believe that

Students

- Students want to learn and they respond best in a positive learning climate.
- All students can learn
- Students learn by doing and taking responsibility for their learning.

Teachers

- Teachers spark a positive attitude towards learning in students through their own enthusiasm and expertise.

Parents

- Parents accept responsibility for their child's education when they involve themselves in their child's school community.
- Parents who value education and are involved, enhance a student's success.

Instruction

- Instruction is best when it is child-centered and appropriate for students.

Instructional Materials

- Instructional materials enhance children's learning and provide a variety of ways to deliver the curriculum.

Techniques

- Techniques are effective when they are multi-sensory and match teacher styles with student learning styles.
- People learn in different ways, rates, and at different times.

Curriculum

- Curriculum meets students' needs when it is timely, relevant, and developmentally appropriate.

Schools

- Schools are effective when they provide a safe, comfortable, and stimulating place in which to learn and teach.
- Schools develop future global citizens.

Goals

ID	Name	Development Status	Progress Status
6771	Goal #1-Reading	Approved	Open
6791	Goal #2- Mathematics	Approved	Open
6817	Goal 3- Spelling	Approved	Open

Goal 1: Goal #1-Reading

Content Area : English Language Arts

Goal Source : cna

Development Status : Approved

Student Goal Statement : All 3-5 grade Amerman students will be 100% proficient in reading by 2012.

Gap Statement : Although student achievement in the area of reading is above average for the state, we have not reached the 100% level of proficiency expected in NCLB. Gender differences are negligible (>5% difference). Last year 4th grade students were 100% proficient. However, there was a slight decrease at the third grade level (100-97%) and the level at 5th grade remained the same (07%). There was a slight decrease in ability in verbal reasoning (87-86%ile).

Cause for Gap : Several variables are possible causes for this gap:

1. Lack of parent involvement.
2. Lack of reading materials at home.
3. Time spent reading.
4. Teaching methodology.
5. Limited intervention services.
6. Ability.
7. Learning disability.

Multiple measures/sources of data you used to identify this gap in student achievement : Data used for this analysis includes Michigan Education Assessment Program (MEAP) reading (grades 3-5), Iowa Test of Basic Skills (ITBS) Reading Total (grades 3 & 5), Cognitive Abilities Test (COGAT, grades 3 &5), and Michigan Literacy Pupil Profile (MLPP), and DRA2.

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? Criteria for success for those identified for Tier II interventions will be the benchmarks established by the district English Language Arts (ELA) curriculum which is aligned with Michigan Department of Education Grade Level Content Expectations. Criteria for success for this goal will be the percent of enrollment deemed "proficient" by the MEAP Reading test.

Goal Progress Update:

Date	User	Progress Status	Explanation of Progress Status
02/03/2010	andersst@northville.k12.mi.us	In Progress	This fall teachers received training in the Class A database system and were given access to this resource. As a result, the data analysis process has just started in terms of data being used to make instructional and intervention decisions. In addition, Amerman's revised Title I plan was submitted to the MDE for approval in January. Once approval is granted, the parent involvement objective and activities will be put in place.

Contact Name : Dr. Anderson Mrs. Carroll

List of Objectives:

ID	Objective
7474	1.R.1. All 3-5 grade Amerman students will be 100% proficient in reading by 2012.

SPR (90) Challenges : None

1.1. Objective: 1.R.1 Reading

Measurable Objective Statement to Support Goal : 1.R.1. All 3-5 grade Amerman students will be 100% proficient in reading by 2012.

Objective Progress Update:

Date	User	Progress Status	Explanation of Progress Status
02/03/2010	andersst@northville.k12.mi.us	In Progress	Progress Status changed from Open to In Progress

List of Strategies:

ID	Strategy	Locked By
7474	District staff will implement effective, research based strategies to increase performance in reading class.	

1.1.1. Strategy: Reading strategy/intervention

Strategy Statement: District staff will implement effective, research based strategies to increase performance in reading class.

Selected Target Areas

--

Other Required Information for Strategy

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

Allington, R. (2009). *What really matters in response to intervention: Research-based designs*. Boston, MA: Pearson.

Allington, R. (2006). *What really matters for struggling readers: Designing research-based programs*. Boston, MA: Pearson.

Commission on Reading (1985) *Becoming a nation of readers: The report of the commission on reading*. Washington, DC: The National Institute of Education.

Fountas, I. and Pinnell, G. (2001). *Guiding readers and writers*. Portsmouth, NH: Heineman.

Gersten, R.; Compton, D.; Connor, C.; Dimino, J.; Santoro, L.; Linan-Thompson, S.; and Tilly, W. *Assisting students struggling with reading: Response to intervention and multi-tier intervention in the primary grades*. Washington, DC: Department of Education, Institute of Education Sciences, What Works Clearinghouse.

Kamil, M.; Mosenthal, P.; Pearson, P.; and Barr, R. (Eds) (2000). *Handbook of reading research*. Mahway, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates, Publishers.

Marzano, R.; Pickering, D.; and Pollock, J. (2001). *Classroom instruction that works: Research based strategies for increasing student achievement*. Alexandria, VA: Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development.

McCardle, P. and Chhabra, V. (2004). *The voice of evidence in reading research*. Baltimore, MD: Paul H. Brooks Publishing Co.

Routman, R. (2000). *Conversations: Strategies for teaching, learning, and evaluating*. Portsmouth, NH: Heineman.

Zemelin, S.; Daniels, H. ; and Hyde, A. (1998). *Best practice: New standards for teaching and learning in America's schools*. Portsmouth, NH: Heinemann.

In addition, Mrs. Carroll and Dr. Anderson are members of the Michigan Reading Association and the International Reading Association and use the following publications: Michigan Reading Journal, The Reading Teacher, and Reading Research Quarterly.

Strategy Progress Update:

Date	User	Progress Status	Explanation of Progress Status
02/03/2010	andersst@northville.k12.mi.us	In Progress	Progress Status changed from Open to In Progress

List of Activities:

Activity	Begin Date	End Date	Staff Responsible
Teachers administer DRA2 and MLPP screening tests to students in September and in May. When completed, teachers with the help of the Learning Consultant input data into Class A database.	09/15/2009	06/01/2013	Classroom teachers in consultation with Learning Consultant
Faculty will compare DRA2, MLPP, MEAP, and ITBS data with ELA benchmarks, norms, and building achievement trends. Data is also cross-referenced to MDE GLCE's to prioritize curriculum, time allocation, and methodology. Grade level teams meet with assigned Intervention Team (IT) consultant.	09/08/2009	06/17/2013	Principal, learning consultant, intervention team consultant, and grade level collegial teams.
For Tier I services for all students a leveled guided reading program model is used. For Tier II intervention services, including Title I, the following activities are used based upon our reading research: Phonemic Awareness (kindergarten)- segmentation, syllable blending, rhyming, phoneme isolation, sound blending, initial and final phonemes, alliteration. Phonics (grades 1-3)- Analytic phonics, embedded phonics, spelling/word sorts, synthetic phonics, analogy phonics. Fluency (grades 1-5)- rate, expression accuracy, phrasing(prosody), and decoding. Comprehension (K-5)- prediction/questioning, retelling/summarizing, making connections, visualizin, inferring, determining importance/main idea, synthesizing, metacognitive awareness, vocabulary. Services are scheduled at various times throught the day to extend ELA instruction by the classroom teachers in consultation with IT staff. For example, "Reading Naturally: is done before school. Other tutoring and small group services are scheduled with the classroom teacher and may be "in-class," in the hallway, or in the reading room. Students are rarely pulled from their regular ELA instruction. Starting in January, an English Language Instruction class will be held after school for identified ELL students, one hour a day, twice a week for seven weeks. In additino, the IT team reviews cases to make	09/30/2009	06/20/2013	Tier I- Faculty Tier II- Learning Consultant, LC parapro, Title I parapro, Teacher Consultant, and Principal

<p>recommendations for summer school support. An inherent part of the parent involvement packet is a bag that goes home daily with suggestions and materials for parents to work with their students to extend learning time.</p>			
<p>Parents will be involved in their students' reading achievement at home. Activities to encourage parent involvement in reading will include the following: 1. The parent involvement policy at Amerman is posted on the Amerman web site. 2. Upon entrance into any Tier II interventions, parents will receive a copy of the parent compact. 3. In Title I intervention services, a weekly envelope will go home containing books, materials to work on at home, progress reports and a means of communication. 4. Amerman Elementary School and the Amerman PTA uses the National PTA's Standards for Parent Involvement and will continue to use these to develop programming. As part of the review process, Amerman staff and the Amerman PTA evaluates their progress on these standards every 3 years. For Title I identified students, parents will be invited to be involved in their child's education the following ways: 1. Grade level curriculum is on the Amerman web page and available 24/7. 2. An Open House is scheduled at the beginning of September to explain grade level procedures and curriculum expectations. 3. Parents are notified of several resources throughout the year: a. Web resources on the Amerman web site. b. The parent library located at Amerman. c. "Fill the summer" program with various resources, camps, summer schools, and ideas from next year's teachers on activities to prepare for next year's class. 4. For students identified at the end of September a parent workshop will be held at the beginning of October to explain the program, answer questions, describe ways parents can help at home, seek parent input, and describe the weekly two-way communication system. All parents will receive a copy of the Amerman Parent Compact. 5. All parents are invited to become a member of the school improvement team. 6. For all students identified after this time, parents will receive a copy of the Amerman Parent Compact. Ongoing parent communication will occur in the following manner: Parent notification and Parent Compact at entrance to services. Annual parent workshop and meeting to explain program, provide resources for parents to work with students and receive suggestions on improvement of intervention services. Held in October and feedback form in weekly packets. Parent/Teacher Conferences in November and April. Individual conferences can be scheduled as needed. Report Cards Quarterly Weekly class newsletters Curricular expectations available 24/7 at www.northville.k12.mi.us/amerman/curriculum. Parent resources in parent library, LC room (A-12), web resources on Amerman web page. "March is Reading Month" activities.</p>	<p>09/30/2009</p>	<p>06/20/2013</p>	<p>Learning Consultant Title I parapro</p>

1.1.1.1. Activity: 1.R.1.1. Reading screening

Activity Description: Teachers administer DRA2 and MLPP screening tests to students in September and in May. When completed, teachers with the help of the Learning Consultant input data into Class A database.

Activity Type: None

Planned staff responsible for implementing activity: Classroom teachers in consultation with Learning Consultant

Actual staff responsible for implementing activity:

Planned Timeline: Begin Date - 09/15/2009, End Date - 06/01/2013

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

Fiscal Resources Needed for Activity:

Resource	Funding Source	Planned Amount	Actual Amount
Classroom teachers, Learning Consultant, LC Parapro	General Funds	232,916.00	232,916.00

Activity Progress Update:

Date	User	Progress Status	Explanation of Progress Status
02/03/2010	andersst@northville.k12.mi.us	In Progress	Progress Status changed from Open to In Progress

1.1.1.2. Activity: 1.R.1.2 Data Analysis

Activity Description: Faculty will compare DRA2, MLPP, MEAP, and ITBS data with ELA benchmarks, norms, and building achievement trends. Data is also cross-referenced to MDE GLCE's to prioritize curriculum, time allocation, and methodology. Grade level teams meet with assigned Intervention Team (IT) consultant.

Activity Type: None

Planned staff responsible for implementing activity: Principal, learning consultant, intervention team consultant, and grade level collegial teams.

Actual staff responsible for implementing activity:

Planned Timeline: Begin Date - 09/08/2009, End Date - 06/17/2013

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

Fiscal Resources Needed for Activity:

Resource	Funding Source	Planned Amount	Actual Amount
Classroom teachers and Intervention Team Members	General Funds	308,750.00	0.00
Substitutes for school improvement meetings	Title II Part A	2,000.00	0.00

1.1.1.3. Activity: 1.R.1.3. Tier II reading intervention

Activity Description: For Tier I services for all students a leveled guided reading program model is used. For Tier II intervention services, including Title I, the following activities are used based upon our reading research: Phonemic Awareness (kindergarten)- segmentation, syllable blending, rhyming, phoneme isolation, sound blending, initial and final phonemes, alliteration. Phonics (grades 1-3)- Analytic phonics, embedded phonics, spelling/word sorts, synthetic phonics, analogy phonics. Fluency (grades 1-5)- rate, expression accuracy, phrasing(prosody), and decoding. Comprehension (K-5)- prediction/questioning, retelling/summarizing, making connections, visualizin, inferring, determining importance/main idea, synthesizing, metacognitive awareness, vocabulary. Services are scheduled at various times throught the day to extend ELA instruction by the classroom teachers in consultation with IT staff. For example, "Reading Naturally: is done before school. Other tutoring and small group services are scheduled with the classroom teacher and may be "in-class," in the hallway, or in the reading room. Students are rarely pulled from their regular ELA instruction. Starting in January, an English Language Instruction class will be held after school for identified ELL students, one hour a day, twice a week for seven weeks. In additino, the IT team reviews cases to make recommendations for summer school support. An inherent part of the parent involvement packet is a bag that goes home daily with suggestions and materials for parents to work with their students to extend learning time.

Activity Type: None

Planned staff responsible for implementing activity: Tier I- Faculty

Tier II- Learning Consultant, LC parapro, Title I parapro, Teacher Consultant, and Principal

Actual staff responsible for implementing activity:

Planned Timeline: Begin Date - 09/30/2009, End Date - 06/20/2013

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

Fiscal Resources Needed for Activity:

Resource	Funding Source	Planned Amount	Actual Amount
Title I intervention	Title I Part A	26,000.00	0.00

1.1.1.4. Activity: 1.R.1.4 Parent involvement

Activity Description: Parents will be involved in their students' reading achievement at home. Activities to encourage parent involvement in reading will include the following:

1. The parent involvement policy at Amerman is posted on the Amerman web site.
2. Upon entrance into any Tier II interventions, parents will receive a copy of the parent compact.
3. In Title I intervention services, a weekly envelope will go home containing books, materials to work on at home, progress reports and a means of communication.
4. Amerman Elementary School and the Amerman PTA uses the National PTA's Standards for Parent Involvement and will continue to use these to develop programming. As part of the review process, Amerman staff and the Amerman PTA evaluates their progress on these standards every 3 years.

For Title I identified students, parents will be invited to be involved in their child's education the following ways:

1. Grade level curriculum is on the Amerman web page and available 24/7.
2. An Open House is scheduled at the beginning of September to explain grade level procedures and curriculum expectations.
3. Parents are notified of several resources throughout the year:
 - a. Web resources on the Amerman web site.
 - b. The parent library located at Amerman.
 - c. "Fill the summer" program with various resources, camps, summer schools, and ideas from next year's teachers on activities to prepare for next year's class.
4. For students identified at the end of September a parent workshop will be held at the beginning of October to explain the program, answer questions, describe ways parents can help at home, seek parent input, and describe the weekly two-way communication system. All parents will receive a copy of the Amerman Parent Compact.
5. All parents are invited to become a member of the school improvement team.
6. For all students identified after this time, parents will receive a copy of the Amerman Parent Compact.

On-going parent communication will occur in the following manner:

Parent notification and Parent Compact at entrance to services.

Annual parent workshop and meeting to explain program, provide resources for parents to work with students and receive suggestions on improvement of intervention services. Held in October and feedback form in weekly packets.

Parent/Teacher Conferences in November and April. Individual conferences can be scheduled as needed.

Report Cards Quarterly

Weekly class newsletters

Curricular expectations available 24/7 at www.northville.k12.mi.us/amerman/curriculum.

Parent resources in parent library, LC room (A-12), web resources on Amerman web page.

"March is Reading Month" activities.

Activity Type: None

Planned staff responsible for implementing activity: Learning Consultant
Title I parapro

Actual staff responsible for implementing activity:

Planned Timeline: Begin Date - 09/30/2009, End Date - 06/20/2013

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

Fiscal Resources Needed for Activity:

Resource	Funding Source	Planned Amount	Actual Amount
Teaching and Office Supplies	General Funds	500.00	0.00

Goal 2: Goal #2- Mathematics

Content Area : Math

Goal Source : cna

Development Status : Approved

Student Goal Statement : Goal 2. All 3-5 grade students will be 100% proficient in mathematics by 2012.

Gap Statement : Amerman's Michigan Education Assessment Program (MEAP) mathematics tests from last year showed 100% proficient at the third and fourth grade levels and 91% at the fifth grade levels. While this may indicate a positive trend, it still does not meet the expectation of NCLB by 2013. Third grade Iowa Test of Basic Skills (ITBS) scores in total math indicate a small decrease from the previous year (90 to 87 average percentile). At the fifth grade level total math subtest scores showed a slight decrease from the previous year (88 to 87 average percentile).

Cause for Gap : There may be several variables associated with this gap.

1. Ability.
2. Parent involvement.
3. Teaching methodology.
4. A lack of an early screening and intervention system like reading.

Multiple measures/sources of data you used to identify this gap in student achievement : Measure used include the MEAP math tests in 3-5 grades; ITBS math concepts, computation, and total math subtests in grades 3 and 5; and end of the year criterion-referenced tests in grades 1 and 2.

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 for success is 100% of student enrollment is deemed "proficient" by the MEAP math test in grades 3-5.

Goal Progress Update:

Date	User	Progress Status	Explanation of Progress Status
02/03/2010	andersst@northville.k12.mi.us	In Progress	2.M.1 Students in grades K-2 are being screened in February.2.M.2. A draft math screening instrument was developed. In the pilot study, correlations ranged from .6 to .8 to teacher rankings and end-of-year math tests.2.M.3. A validation study to revise the instrument, administer, and correlate to standardized data (ITBS) has been written and

		submitted to NCTM.2.M.4. The IS team has not started the process of developing an intervention program, but is scheduled to do so in the spring.2.M.5. Since the intervention program is still in design, the parent involvement program has not started.
--	--	---

Contact Name : Steve Anderson

List of Objectives:

ID	Objective
7481	2.M.1. All 3-5 grade Amerman students will be 100% proficient in mathematics as measured by the MEAP math test by 2012.

SPR (90) Challenges : None

2.1. Objective: 2.M.1 Math achievement

Measurable Objective Statement to Support Goal : 2.M.1. All 3-5 grade Amerman students will be 100% proficient in mathematics as measured by the MEAP math test by 2012.

Objective Progress Update:

Date	User	Progress Status	Explanation of Progress Status
02/03/2010	andersst@northville.k12.mi.us	In Progress	Progress Status changed from Open to In Progress

List of Strategies:

ID	Strategy	Locked By
7481	District staff will implement effective, research-based strategies to increase performance in mathematics during the school year.	

2.1.1. Strategy: 2.M.1 Math achievement

Strategy Statement: District staff will implement effective, research-based strategies to increase

performance in mathematics during the school year.

Selected Target Areas

--

Other Required Information for Strategy

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

Two areas of literature review were conducted for this goal. The first is to review the current state of math assessment and determine causes of math difficulties. The following is the bibliography for that topic:

Adams, T. (1998, Summer). Alternative assessment in elementary school mathematics. *Childhood Education*, 220-224.

Berch, D. (2005). Making sense of number sense: Implications for children with mathematical disabilities. *Journal of Learning Disabilities*, 38, 4, 333-339.

Bull, R. and Johnston, R. (1997). Children's arithmetical difficulties: Contributions from processing speed, item identification, and short-term memory. *Journal of Experimental Child Psychology*, 65, 1-24.

Clark, B. and Shinn, M. (2004). A preliminary investigation into the identification and development of early mathematics curriculum-based measurement. *School Psychology Review*, 33, 2, 234-248.

Dowker, A. (2005). Early identification and intervention for students with mathematics difficulties. *Journal of Learning Disabilities*, 38, 4, 324-332.

Downer, J. and Pianta, R. (2006). Academic and cognitive functioning in first grade: Associations with earlier home and child care predictors and with concurrent home and classroom experience. *School Psychology Review*, 35, 1, 11-30.

Durand, M.; Hulme, C.; Larkin, R.; and Snowling, M. (2005). The cognitive foundations of reading and arithmetic skills in 7- to 10-year-olds. *Journal of Experimental Child Psychology*, 91, 113-136.

Geary, D. (2004). Mathematics and learning disabilities. *Journal of Learning Disabilities*, 37, 1, 4-15.

Geary, D. (1993). Mathematical disabilities: Cognitive, neuropsychological and genetic components. *Psychological Bulletin*, 114, 2, 345-362.

Gersten, R.; Clarke, B.; and Jordan, N. (2007). Screening for mathematics difficulties in K-3 students. Center on Instruction, www.centeroninstruction.org.

Gersten, R.; Jordan, N.; and Flojo, J. (2005). Early identification and interventions for students with mathematics difficulties. *Journal of Learning Disabilities*, 38, 4, 293-304.

Fletcher, J. (2005). Predicting math outcomes: Reading predictors and comorbidity. *Journal of Learning Disabilities*, 38, 4, 308-312.

Foegen, A.; Jiban, C.; and Deno, S. (2007). Progress monitoring measures in mathematics: A review of literature. *The Journal of Special Education*, 41, 2, 121-139.

- Foster, D. and Noyce, P. (2004). The mathematics assessment collaborative: Performance testing to improve instruction. *Phi Delta Kappan*, 85, 5, 367.
- Hopkins, M. (1997, Winter). Getting real: Implementing assessment alternatives in mathematics. *Preventing School Failure*, 41, 2, 77-84.
- Jordan, N.; Kaplan, D.; Locuniak, M; Ramineni, C. (2007). Predicting first-grade math achievement from developmental number sense trajectories. *Learning Disabilities Research and Practice*, 22, 1, 36-46.
- Markovits, Z.; Hershkowitz, R.; and Bruckheimer, M. (2002). Number sense and nonsense. In Donald L. Chambers (Ed.). *Putting research in practice in the elementary grades: Readings from journals of the National Council of Teachers of Mathematics* (pp. 87-89). Reston, VA: National Council of Teachers of Mathematics.
- Mazzocco, M. and Thompson, R. (2005). Kindergarten predictors of math learning disability. *Learning Disabilities Research and Practice*, 20, 3, 142-155.
- National Council of Teachers of Mathematics (2006). *Curriculum focal points for prekindergarten through grade 8 mathematics*. Reston, VA: author.
- National Council of Teachers of Mathematics (1995). *Assessment standards*. Reston, VA: author.
- Parke, C. (2002). Mathematics performance assessment: Discovering why some items or rubrics don't measure up. *RMLE Online*, 25, 1, 1-25.
- Reys, B. et al (1991). *Developing number sense in the middle grades. Addenda Series, Grades 5-8*. Reston, VA: National Council of Teachers of Mathematics.
- Romberg, T. and Carpenter, T. (1986). Research on teaching and learning mathematics. In M. C. Wittrock (Ed.). *Handbook of Research on Teaching* (pp. 850-873). New York: MacMillan Publishing Company.
- Siegler, R. and Booth, J. (2004). Development of numerical estimation in young children. *Child Development*, 75, 2, 428-444.
- Stecker, P.; Fuchs, L.; and Fuchs, D. (2005). Using curriculum-based measurement to improve student achievement: Review of research. *Psychology in the Schools*, 42, 8, 795-819.
- Stecker, P.; and Fuchs, L. (2000). Effecting superior achievement using curriculum-based measurement: The importance of individual progress monitoring. *Learning Disabilities Research and Practice*, 15, 3, 128-134.
- Sowder, J. and Schappelle, B. (2002). Number sense-Making. In Donald L. Chambers (Ed.). *Putting research in practice in the elementary grades: Readings from journals of the National Council of Teachers of Mathematics* (pp. 82-86). Reston, VA: National Council of Teachers of Mathematics.
- Tall, D. (2004). Thinking through three worlds of mathematics. *Proceedings of the 28th Conference of the International Group for the Psychology of Mathematics Education*, 4, 281-288.
- VanDerHeyden, A; Broussard, C.; and Cooley, A. (2006). Further development of measures of early math performances for preschoolers. *Journal of School Psychology*, 44, 6, 533-553.
- Warren, E. and Nisbet, S. (2001). How grades 1-7 teachers assess mathematics and how they use

assessment data. *School Science and Mathematics*, 101, 7, 348-355

The second area of literature review was to determine what math intervention strategies have been successful. The following is the research and literature reviewed for that topic:

Baker, s., Gersten, R., & Lee, D. (2002). A synthesis of empirical research on teaching mathematics to low-achieving students. *The Elementary School Journal*, 103, 51-73.

Bryant, D.; Bryant, B.; Gersten, R.; Scammacca, N.; & Chavez, M. (2008). Mathematics intervention for first- and second-grade students with mathematics difficulties: The effects of tier 2 intervention delivered as booster lessons. *Remedial and Special Education*, 29, 1, 20-32.

Cawley, J. (2002). Mathematics interventions and students with high-incidence disabilities. *Remedial and Special Education*, 23, 1, 2-6.

Fuchs, L., Fuchs, D., & Karns, K. (2001) Enhancing kindergarteners' mathematical development: Effects of peer-assisted learning strategies. *The Elementary School Journal*, 101, 495-511.

Fuchs, L. & Fuchs, D. (2001). Principles for the prevention and intervention of mathematics difficulties. *Learning Disabilities Research and Practice*, 16, 85-95.

Geary, D. (1990). A componential analysis of an early learning deficit in mathematics. *Journal of Experimental Child Psychology*, 33, 386-404.

Geary, D. (2004). Mathematics and learning disabilities. *Journal of Learning Disabilities*, 37, 4-15.

Gersten, R., Jordan, N., & Flojo, J. Early identification and intervention for students with mathematics difficulties. *Journal of Learning Disabilities*, 38, 293-304.

Gersten, R.; Chard, D.; Baker, S. Jayanthi, M.; Flojo, J.; and Lee, D. (in preparation). Teaching mathematics to students with learning disabilities: A synthesis of the intervention research.

Gersten, R.; Beckmann, S.; Clarke, B.; Foegen, A.; Marsh, L.; Star, J.; and Witzel, B. (2009). Assisting students struggling with mathematics: Response to Intervention (RtI) for elementary and middle schools (NCEE2090-4060). Washington, DC: National Center for Education Evaluation and Regional Assistance, Institute of Education Sciences, U.S. Department of Education.
<http://ies.ed.gov/ncee/wwc/publications/practiceguides/>.

Gersten, R.; Chard, D.; Jayanthi, M. ; Baker, S.; and Lee, D. (2006). A meta-analysis of research on mathematics interventions for elementary students with learning disabilities. Manuscript under review.

Ketterlin-Geller, L.; Chard, D.; and Fien, H. (2008). Making connections in mathematics: Conceptual mathematics intervention for low-performing students. *Remedial and Special Education*, 29, 1, 33-45.

Kroesbergen, E. & Van Luit, J. (2003). Mathematics interventions for students with special educational needs: A meta-analysis. *Remedial and Special Education*, 24, 97-114.

Ma. L. and Kessel, C. (2003) *Knowing mathematics*. Boston, MA: Houghton Mifflin.

Swanson, H.; Hoskyn, M. & Lee, C. (1999). *Interventions for students with learning disabilities: A meta-analysis of treatment outcomes*. New York: Guilford.

Tepmpleton, T.; Neel, R.; and Blood, E. (2008). Meta-analysis of math interventions for students with

emotional and behavior disorders. *Journal of Emotional and Behavioral Disorders*, 16, 4, 226-239.

Vaughn, S. Moody, S. & Schumm, J. (1998). Broken promises: Reading instruction in the resource room.

The following is the math intervention research reviewed for this objective:

Baker, s., Gersten, R., & Lee, D. (2002). A synthesis of empirical research on teaching mathematics to low-achieving students. *The Elementary School Journal*, 103, 51-73.

Bryant, D.; Bryant, B.; Gersten, R.; Scammacca, N.; & Chavez, M. (2008). Mathematics intervention for first- and second-grade students with mathematics difficulties: The effects of tier 2 intervention delivered as booster lessons. *Remedial and Special Education*, 29, 1, 20-32.

Cawley, J. (2002). Mathematics interventions and students with high-incidence disabilities. *Remedial and Special Education*, 23, 1, 2-6.

Fuchs, L., Fuchs, D., & Karns, K. (2001) Enhancing kindergarteners' mathematical development: Effects of peer-assisted learning strategies. *The Elementary School Journal*, 101, 495-511.

Fuchs, L. & Fuchs, D. (2001). Principles for the prevention and intervention of mathematics difficulties. *Learning Disabilities Research and Practice*, 16, 85-95.

Geary, D. (1990). A componential analysis of an early learning deficit in mathematics. *Journal of Experimental Child Psychology*, 33, 386-404.

Geary, D. (2004). Mathematics and learning disabilities. *Journal of Learning Disabilities*, 37, 4-15.

Gersten, R., Jordan, N., & Flojo, J. Early identification and intervention for students with mathematics difficulties. *Journal of Learning Disabilities*, 38, 293-304.

Gersten, R.; Chard, D.; Baker, S. Jayanthi, M.; Flojo, J.; and Lee, D. (in preparation). Teaching mathematics to students with learning disabilities: A synthesis of the intervention research.

Gersten, R.; Beckmann, S.; Clarke, B.; Foegen, A.; Marsh, L.; Star, J.; and Witzel, B. (2009). Assisting students struggling with mathematics: Response to Intervention (RtI) for elementary and middle schools (NCEE2090-4060). Washington, DC: National Center for Education Evaluation and Regional Assistance, Institute of Education Sciences, U.S. Department of Education.
<http://ies.ed.gov/ncee/wwc/publications/practiceguides/>.

Gersten, R.; Chard, D.; Jayanthi, M. ; Baker, S.; and Lee, D. (2006). A meta-analysis of research on mathematics interventions for elementary students with learning disabilities. Manuscript under review.

Ketterlin-Geller, L.; Chard, D.; and Fien, H. (2008). Making connections in mathematics: Conceptual mathematics intervention for low-performing students. *Remedial and Special Education*, 29, 1, 33-45.

Kroesbergen, E. & Van Luit, J. (2003). Mathematics interventions for students with special educational needs: A meta-analysis. *Remedial and Special Education*, 24, 97-114.

Ma. L. and Kessel, C. (2003) *Knowing mathematics*. Boston, MA: Houghton Mifflin.

Swanson, H.; Hoskyn, M. & Lee, C. (1999). Interventions for students with learning disabilities: A meta-analysis of treatment outcomes. New York: Guilford.

Tepmpleton, T.; Neel, R.; and Blood, E. (2008). Meta-analysis of math interventions for students with emotional and behavior disorders. *Journal of Emotional and Behavioral Disorders*, 16, 4, 226-239.

Vaughn, S. Moody, S. & Schumm, J. (1998). Broken promises: Reading instruction in the resource room. *Exceptional Children*, 64, 211-225.

For the parent involvement activity, Amerman uses the research and national standards in its review of parent involvement and certification by the National PTA. In addition, we have used the following research and best practices:

Epstein, J. et al (2009). *School, family, and community partnerships: Your handbook for Action* (3rd. Ed). Thousands Oaks, CA: Corwin Press.

Henderson, A.; Mapp, K.; Johnson, V.; and Davies, D. (2007). *Beyond the bake sale: The essential guide to family-school partnerships*. New York: The New Press.

Strategy Progress Update:

Date	User	Progress Status	Explanation of Progress Status
02/03/2010	andersst@northville.k12.mi.us	In Progress	Progress Status changed from Open to In Progress

List of Activities:

Activity	Begin Date	End Date	Staff Responsible
MEAP tests are administered in October to grades 3-5. ITBS and COGAT tests are administered to third and fifth grade tests in February. Data is entered into Class A database. Meetings are scheduled with grades 3-5 by Learning Consultant and IT representative to review data and assess student and curricular needs.	10/01/2009	06/17/2010	Classroom teachers, Learning Consultant, Intervention Team (IT) liaison.
Develop and field test a math screening instrument for grades K-2 based upon the research and using the National Council of Teachers of Mathematics (NCTM,2006) Curriculum Focul Points for Prekindergarten through Grade 8 Mathematics and NCTM's (2001) Mathematics Assessment: A Practical Handbook. Revise draft based upon analysis of pilot study data for discrimination, average administration tiem, and correlation to teacher rankings.	09/30/2009	06/20/2010	Principal, kindergarten teachers, first grade teachers, and second grade teachers.
For the pilot study, administer screening instrument to students in K, 1, and 2 recommended by their teachers. Compare results to rank orders and end of the year test data. For validation study administer revised screening instrument to all K, 1, and 2 students. Compare and correlate data for significance (r<.05) The impact envisioned for this proposal is the consistend screening of primary students to identify "at risk" students early and provide the appropriate intervention.	09/30/2009	06/20/2010	Principal and kindergarten, first, and second grade teachers.
Review literature on best practice and research on math	09/30/2009	06/20/2012	Principal;

<p>intervention. Using this information and feedback from classroom teachers develop a math intervention program. Collaborate with grade level teams, intervention team, and learning consultant to design a program on perceived needs. Begin pilot with recommended students in kindergarten, first, and second grades. Monitor students progress based upon math screening and end-of-the-year summative assessments. Revise program based upon data and teacher observations.</p>			<p>kindergarten, first, and second grade faculty; and intervention team.</p>
<p>Coordinate with PTA math committee and faculty math committee to plan events for "October is Math Month." While developing intervention program, design and create parent packets to send home with students to include a progress report, materials, and listing of additional resources. Schedule meeting for parents of identified students for math intervention program to describe the program, discuss ways to work with their students at home, and availability of additional resources. Pass out parent compact to all students identified for math intervention.</p>	<p>09/30/2009</p>	<p>06/20/2012</p>	<p>Principal; IT team; and kindergarten, first, and second grade teachers.</p>

2.1.1.1. Activity: 2.M.1.1 Current math needs assessment

Activity Description: MEAP tests are administered in October to grades 3-5.

ITBS and COGAT tests are administered to third and fifth grade tests in February.

Data is entered into Class A database.

Meetings are scheduled with grades 3-5 by Learning Consultant and IT representative to review data and assess student and curricular needs.

Activity Type: None

Planned staff responsible for implementing activity: Classroom teachers, Learning Consultant, Intervention Team (IT) liaison.

Actual staff responsible for implementing activity:

Planned Timeline: Begin Date - 10/01/2009, End Date - 06/17/2010

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

Fiscal Resources Needed for Activity:

Resource	Funding Source	Planned Amount	Actual Amount
Classroom teachers, learning consultant, and IT liaison	General Funds	254,583.00	254,583.00

Activity Progress Update:

Date	User	Progress Status	Explanation of Progress Status
02/03/2010	andersst@northville.k12.mi.us	In Progress	Progress Status changed from Open to In Progress

2.1.1.2. Activity: 2.M.1.2. Math screening

Activity Description: Develop and field test a math screening instrument for grades K-2 based upon the research and using the National Council of Teachers of Mathematics (NCTM,2006) Curriculum Focul Points for Prekindergarten through Grade 8 Mathematics and NCTM's (2001) Mathematics Assessment: A Practical Handbook. Revise draft based upon analysis of pilot study data for discrimination, average administration tiem, and correlation to teacher rankings.

Activity Type: None

Planned staff responsible for implementing activity: Principal, kindergarten teachers, first grade teachers, and second grade teachers.

Actual staff responsible for implementing activity:

Planned Timeline: Begin Date - 09/30/2009, End Date - 06/20/2010

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

Fiscal Resources Needed for Activity:

Resource	Funding Source	Planned Amount	Actual Amount
Estimated time of principal and faculty	General Funds	3,000.00	0.00

2.1.1.3. Activity: 2.M.1.3. Pilot and validation study

Activity Description: For the pilot study, administer screening instrument to students in K, 1, and 2 recommended by their teachers. Compare results to rank orders and end of the year test data. For validation study administer revised screening instrument to all K, 1, and 2 students. Compare and correlate data for significance ($r < .05$)

The impact envisioned for this proposal is the consistend screening of primary students to identify "at risk" students early and provide the appropriate intervention.

Activity Type: None

Planned staff responsible for implementing activity: Principal and kindergarten, first, and second grade teachers.

Actual staff responsible for implementing activity:

Planned Timeline: Begin Date - 09/30/2009, End Date - 06/20/2010

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

Fiscal Resources Needed for Activity:

Resource	Funding Source	Planned Amount	Actual Amount
Estimated staff time	General Funds	3,000.00	0.00
Conference funds for math workshops	Title II Part A	1,000.00	0.00

2.1.1.4. Activity: 2.M.1.4 Math Intervention

Activity Description: Review literature on best practice and research on math intervention. Using this information and feedback from classroom teachers develop a math intervention program. Collaborate with grade level teams, intervention team, and learning consultant to design a program on perceived needs. Begin pilot with recommended students in kindergarten, first, and second grades. Monitor students progress based upon math screening and end-of-the-year summative assessments. Revise program based upon data and teacher observations.

Activity Type: None

Planned staff responsible for implementing activity: Principal; kindergarten, first, and second grade faculty; and intervention team.

Actual staff responsible for implementing activity:

Planned Timeline: Begin Date - 09/30/2009, End Date - 06/20/2012

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

Fiscal Resources Needed for Activity:

Resource	Funding Source	Planned Amount	Actual Amount
Estimated teaching supplies	General Funds	300.00	0.00

2.1.1.5. Activity: 2.M.1.5. Parent involvement.

Activity Description: Coordinate with PTA math committee and faculty math committee to plan events for "October is Math Month."

While developing intervention program, design and create parent packets to send home with students to include a progress report, materials, and listing of additional resources.

Schedule meeting for parents of identified students for math intervention program to describe the program, discuss ways to work with their students at home, and availability of additional resources.

Pass out parent compact to all students identified for math intervention.

Activity Type: None

Planned staff responsible for implementing activity: Principal; IT team; and kindergarten, first, and second grade teachers.

Actual staff responsible for implementing activity:

Planned Timeline: Begin Date - 09/30/2009, End Date - 06/20/2012

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

Fiscal Resources Needed for Activity:

Resource	Funding Source	Planned Amount	Actual Amount
Misc. supply budget	General Funds	300.00	0.00
PTA Budget for Math Month	PTA Budget	300.00	0.00

Goal 3: Goal 3- Spelling

Content Area : English Language Arts

Goal Source : cna

Development Status : Approved

Student Goal Statement : 3.0 All students in grades 3 and 5 will be above the 50th percentile on the ITBS spelling subtest by 2012.

Gap Statement : The ITBS spelling subtest at the third grade level decrease from 89 to 85 average percentile. At the fifth grade level ITBS spelling subtest scores remained constant at 82 average percentile. Literature in the areas of spelling and brain research seems to suggest that students could improve if they used a word sort methodology to find patterns versus a traditional approach that relies on repetition.

Cause for Gap : Hypothesized causes are as follows:

1. Ability.
2. Parent involvement.
3. Teaching methodology.

Multiple measures/sources of data you used to identify this gap in student achievement : The school

improvement team assessed both Iowa Test of Basic Skills spelling subtest scores, classroom formative assessments, and teacher observations.

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? Criteria: All students in grades 3 and 5 will be above the 50th %ile on the ITBS by 2012.

Goal Progress Update:

Date	User	Progress Status	Explanation of Progress Status
02/03/2010	andersst@northville.k12.mi.us	In Progress	3.1. A developmental instrument was adopted from the literature review and MLPP. 3.2. A pilot study was carried out last year. Spelling was a subject of a building professional development workshop. The observation and feedback from the teachers seem to indicate that students responded differently to different methods of instruction.3.3. A proposal was submitted to the central office to develop two samples (classrooms) of "traditional" method spelling and "word sort" method of spelling in both the third and fifth grades. The research proposed that the ITBS spelling subtest and COGAT be used to determine whether there was an overall effect and whether there was an achievement relationship between spelling method and ability.

Contact Name : Mrs. Carroll Dr. Anderson

List of Objectives:

ID	Objective
7498	3.1. All students in grades 3 and 5 will be above the 50th percentile on the ITBS by 2012.

SPR (90) Challenges : None

3.1. Objective: 3.1. Spelling achievement

Measurable Objective Statement to Support Goal : 3.1. All students in grades 3 and 5 will be above the 50th percentile on the ITBS by 2012.

Objective Progress Update:

Date	User	Progress Status	Explanation of Progress Status
02/03/2010	andersst@northville.k12.mi.us	In Progress	Progress Status changed from Open to In Progress

List of Strategies:

ID	Strategy	Locked By
7498	District staff will review literature to determine a valid and reliable screening instrument, revise methodology, and develop an action research study to evaluate different methodologies.	

3.1.1. Strategy: 3.1. Spelling screening

Strategy Statement: District staff will review literature to determine a valid and reliable screening instrument, revise methodology, and develop an action research study to evaluate different methodologies.

Selected Target Areas

--

Other Required Information for Strategy

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

Bibliography of general research on spelling:

Berninger, V.; Vaughan, K.; Abbott, R.; Brooks, A.; Abbott, S.; Rogan, L.; Reed, E.; and Graham, S. (1998). Early intervention for spelling problems: Teaching functional spelling units of varying size with multiple-connections framework. *Journal of Educational Psychology*, 90, 4, 587-605.

Ehri, L. (2004). Teaching phonemic awareness and phonics: an explanation of the National Reading Panel meta-analyses. In P. McCardle and V. Chhabra (Eds.), *The voice of evidence in reading research*. (pp. 153-186). Baltimore, MD: Paul H. Brooks Publishing.

Ehri, L. (1989). The development of spelling knowledge and its role in reading acquisition and reading disability. *Journal of Learning Disabilities*, 22, 6, 356-364.

Ehri, L. (1987). Learning to read and spell words. *Journal of Reading Behavior*, 19, 5-31.

Ellis, N. & Cataldo, S. (1992). Spelling is integral to learning to read. In C.M. Sterling and C. Robson (Eds.). *Psychology, spelling, and education* (pp. 122-142). Clevedon, UK: Multilingual Matters.

Frith, U. (1985). Beneath the surface of developmental dyslexia. In K. Patterson, J. Marshal, & M. Colheart

(Eds.), *Surface dyslexia* (pp. 301-330). London: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.

Gill, C. and Sharer, P. (1996). Why do they get it on Friday and misspell it on Monday? Teachers inquiring about their students as spellers. *Language Arts*, 73, 89-96.

Graham, S.; Harris, K.; and Chrzempa, B. (2002). Contribution of spelling instruction to the spelling, writing, and reading of poor spellers. *Journal of Educational Psychology*, 94, 4, 669-686.

Henry, M. (1989). Children's word structure knowledge: Implications for decoding and spelling instruction. *Reading and Writing: An Interdisciplinary Journal*, 2, 135-152.

Hughes, M. & Searle, D. (1997). *The violent e and other tricky sounds: Learning to spell from kindergarten through grade 6*. York, ME: Stenhouse.

Invernizzi, M. and Hayes, L. (2004). Developmental-spelling research: A systematic imperative. *Reading Research Quarterly*, 39, 2, 216-228.

Invernizzi, M.; Abouzeid, M.; and Gill, J. (1994). Using students' invented spellings as a guide for spelling instruction that emphasizes word study. *The Elementary School Journal*, 95, 2, 154-167.

McCardle, P. and Chhabra, V. (2004). *The voice of evidence in reading research*. Baltimore, MD: Paul H. Brooks Publishing.

Moats, L. (2004). Science, language, and imagination in the professional development of reading teachers. In P. McCardle, and V. Chhabra (Eds.), *The voice of evidence in reading research*, (pp. 269-287). Baltimore, MD: Paul H. Brooks Publishing.

Moats, L. (2005/2006, Winter). How spelling supports reading: And why it is more regular and predictable than you may think. *American Educator*, 12-43.

Morris, D.; Blanton, L.; Blanton, W.; Nowacek, J.; and Perney, J. (1995). Teaching low-achieving spellers at their "instructional level.": *The Elementary School Journal*, 96, 2, 163-177.

Templeton, S. and Morris, D. (1999). Questions teachers ask about spelling. *Reading Research Quarterly*, 34, 1, 102-112.

Templeton, S. and Morris, D. (2000). Spelling. In M. L. Kamil, P. B. Mosenthal, P. D. Pearson, and R. Barr (Eds.), *Handbook of reading research: Volume 3* (pp. 525-543). Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Assoc.

Bibliography of research and literature on "word sort" methodology:

Abbott, M. (). Effects of Traditional Versus Extended Word-Study Spelling Instruction on Students' Orthographic Knowledge.

Bear, D. and Templeton, S. (1998). Explorations in developmental spelling: Foundations for learning and teaching phonics, spelling, and vocabulary. *The Reading Teacher*, 52 (3), 224-242.

Beers, J., and Beers, C., and Grant, K. (1977). The Logic behind Children's Spelling. *The Elementary School Journal*, 77, 238-242.

Beers, C. The Relationship of Cognitive Development to Spelling and

Reading Abilities. In E. H. Henderson & J. W. (Eds.), *Developmental and cognitive aspects of learning to spell* (pp. 74-84). Newark, DE: International Reading Association.

Coiner, J. (1995). *Is Word Study the Best Approach to Spelling Instruction? A Study in the Effectiveness of Word Study vs. a Traditional Approach to Spelling Instruction.*

Dahl, K., Barto, A., Bonfils, A., Carasello, M., Christopher, J., Davis, R., Erkkila, N., Glander, S., Jacobs, B., Kendra, V., Koski, L., Majeski, D., McConnell, E., Petrie, P., Siegel, D., Slaby, B., Wladbauer, J., and Williams, J. (2003). *Connecting developmental word study with classroom writing: Children's descriptions of spelling strategies.* International Reading Association, 310-319.

Ehri, L. (). *The Development of Spelling Knowledge and its Role in Reading Acquisition and Reading Disability.* Journal of Learning Disabilities.

Graham, S., Harris, K., (2002). *Contribution of Spelling Instruction to the Spelling, Writing, and Reading of Poor Spellers.* Journal of Educational Psychology, 94 (4), 669-686.

Gill, C., and Scharer, P. (1996). *"Why Do They Get It On Friday And Misspell It On Monday? Teachers Inquiring About Their Students As Spellers.* Language Arts, 73, 89-96.

Greenberg, D., Ehri, L., Perin, D. (1997) *Are Word-Reading Processes the Same or Different in Adult Literacy Students and Third-fifth Graders Matched For Reading Level?* Journal of Educational Psychology, 89 (2), 262-275.

Henderson, E. *Word Knowledge and Reading Disability.* In E. H. Henderson & J. W. (Eds.), *Developmental and cognitive aspects of learning to spell* (pp. 138-148). Newark, DE: International Reading Association.

Henry, M. (1989). *Children's Word Structure Knowledge: Implications For Decoding and Spelling Instruction.* Reading and Writing: An Interdisciplinary Journal, 2, 135-152.

Henry, M. *Organizing Decoding Instruction. All Language and the Creation of Literacy, The Orton Dyslexia.* 1991. PDF available: www.donpotter.net/PDF/Organizing%20Decoding%20instruction%20-%20Henry.pdf. (11-06).

Invernizzi, M. and Hayes, L. (2004). *Developmental-spelling research: A systematic imperative.* Reading Research Quarterly, 39 (2), 216-227.

Invernizzi, M. and Abouzed, M. (1994). *Using Students' Invented Spellings as a Guide for Spelling Instruction That Emphasizes Word Study.* The Elementary School Journal, 95 (2), 155-167.

Moats, L. *How Spelling Supports Reading And Why it Is More*

Regular Than You May Think. American Educator, Winter 2005/06, 12-43.

Morris, D. Beginning Readers' Concept of Word. In E. H. Henderson & J. W. (Eds.), Developmental and cognitive aspects of learning to spell (pp. 97-111). Newark, DE: International Reading Association.

Read, C., Pre-School Children's Knowledge of English Phonology (1971). Harvard Educational Review, 41 (1), 1-34.

Sangston, A., (1995). Word study vs. Traditional Spelling: Are Students Instructed Through Word Study More Likely to Have Higher Retention Rates When Retested Two and Four Weeks Later, and Will They be More Successful at Spelling Unfamiliar Words? RESEARCH UNIVERSITY of Virginia 98 pages

Tangel, D. and Benita, B. (1995). Effect of Phoneme Awareness Instruction On The Invented Spelling Of First-Grade Children: A One-Year Follow-Up. Journal of Reading Behavior, 27 (2), 153-185.

Templeton, S. (2000). Spelling. Handbook of Reading Research, 3, 525-543.

Templeton, S. What Is a Word? In E. H. Henderson & J. W. (Eds.), Developmental and cognitive aspects of learning to spell (pp. 15-35). Newark, DE: International Reading Association.

Treiman, R. (1984). Individual Differences among Children in Spelling and Reading Styles. Journal of Experimental Child Psychology, 37, 463-477.

Strategy Progress Update:

Date	User	Progress Status	Explanation of Progress Status
02/03/2010	andersst@northville.k12.mi.us	In Progress	Progress Status changed from Open to In Progress

List of Activities:

Activity	Begin Date	End Date	Staff Responsible
3.1.1. Explore resources of the Department of Education (ERIC), the International Reading Association (IRA), and the libraries of the University of Michigan and Michigan State University to find professional literature and research on the subject of spelling and spelling methodology.	05/18/2009	09/08/2009	Dr. Anderson and Mrs. Carroll
Based upon the review of literature, research, and screening data selected teachers will implement a word study approach to teaching spelling. To implement the following steps will apply: (1) creation of a summary of literature and professional development, (2) volunteer teachers implement "word sort" methodology, (3) faculty discusses and analyzes feedback from	09/08/2009	06/17/2010	Principal and Learning Consultant.

pilot study, and (4)principal and learning consultant design an action research study to test hypotheses.			
Principal and learning consultant will use a quasi-experimental model to conduct action research. Anticipated data is interval. Statistical techniques used will be the student T and two-way ANOVA for analysis. A priori level of significance is less than .05. Instrumentation is the ITBS spelling subtest and COGAT composit and verbal scores. Steps involved in this activity include the following: (1)identify experimental and control groups, (2) obtain informed consent, (3)schedule professional development for participating faculty, (4)administer ITBS and COGAT to third and fifth graders, conduct analysis using Excel and SPSS, and present results to faculty and District School Improvement Team.	09/08/2009	08/01/2012	Teachers in experimental and control groups Principal and Learning Consultant

3.1.1.1. Activity: 3.1.1. Review literature

Activity Description: 3.1.1. Explore resources of the Department of Education (ERIC), the International Reading Association (IRA), and the libraries of the University of Michigan and Michigan State University to find professional literature and research on the subject of spelling and spelling methodology.

Activity Type: None

Planned staff responsible for implementing activity: Dr. Anderson and Mrs. Carroll

Actual staff responsible for implementing activity:

Planned Timeline: Begin Date - 05/18/2009, End Date - 09/08/2009

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

Fiscal Resources Needed for Activity:

Resource	Funding Source	Planned Amount	Actual Amount
Estimated time per salary	General Funds	2,000.00	0.00

Activity Progress Update:

Date	User	Progress Status	Explanation of Progress Status
02/03/2010	andersst@northville.k12.mi.us	In Progress	Progress Status changed from Open to In Progress

3.1.1.2. Activity: 3.1.2. Implement word sort methodology

Activity Description: Based upon the review of literature, research, and screening data selected teachers will implement a word study approach to teaching spelling. To implement the following steps will apply: (1) creation of a summary of literature and professional development, (2) volunteer teachers implement "word sort" methodology, (3)faculty discusses and analyzes feedback from pilot study, and (4)principal and learning consultant design an action research study to test hypotheses.

Activity Type: None

Planned staff responsible for implementing activity: Principal and Learning Consultant.

Actual staff responsible for implementing activity:

Planned Timeline: Begin Date - 09/08/2009, End Date - 06/17/2010

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

Fiscal Resources Needed for Activity:

Resource	Funding Source	Planned Amount	Actual Amount
Estimated staff time	General Funds	1,000.00	0.00

3.1.1.3. Activity: 3.1.3. Conduct action research

Activity Description: Principal and learning consultant will use a quasi-experimental model to conduct action research. Anticipated data is interval. Statistical techniques used will be the student T and two-way ANOVA for analysis. A priori level of significance is less than .05. Instrumentation is the ITBS spelling subtest and COGAT composit and verbal scores. Steps involved in this activity include the following: (1)identify experimental and control groups, (2) obtain informed consent, (3)schedule professional development for participating faculty, (4)administer ITBS and COGAT to third and fifth graders, conduct analysis using Excel and SPSS, and present results to faculty and District School Improvement Team.

Activity Type: None

Planned staff responsible for implementing activity: Teachers in experimental and control groups
Principal and Learning Consultant

Actual staff responsible for implementing activity:

Planned Timeline: Begin Date - 09/08/2009, End Date - 08/01/2012

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

Fiscal Resources Needed for Activity:

Resource	Funding Source	Planned Amount	Actual Amount
Estimated staff time	General Funds	2,000.00	0.00

Resource Profile

Funding Source	Planned Amount	Actual Amount
General Funds	\$808,349.00	\$487,499.00
Title I Part A	\$26,000.00	\$0.00
Title II Part A	\$3,000.00	\$0.00
Other	\$300.00	\$0.00

Title I Required Components

As part of the School Improvement Plan (SIP) submittal process for a given school year, each building receiving Title I funds is required to complete either a Title I Schoolwide Required Components or a Title I Targeted Assistance Required Components. The current status of the Title I Required Components is listed below. The SIP cannot be submitted until the Title I Required Components has a status of Submitted.

Report	Open Date	Due Date	Status
Required Components	12/02/2009	09/01/2010	Submitted

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
Dr.	Stephen	Anderson	Principal and IT member	andersst@northville.k12.mi.us
Mrs.	Margie	Carroll	Learning Consultant and I	carrolma@northville.k12.mi.us
Mrs.	Jennifer	Bonutti	First grade chairperson	bonnutje@northville.k12.mi.us
Mrs.	Leann	Wells	2nd Grade Chairperson	wellsle@northville.k12.mi.us
Mrs.	Juliann	Mooney	3rd Grade Chairperson	mooneyju@northville.k12.mi.us
Mr.	Richard	Tabor	4th Grade Chairperson	taborri@northville.k12.mi.us
Mrs.	Rose	McDougall	5th Grade Chairperson	mcdougro@northville.k12.mi.us
Mr.	Bruce	Ricketts	ALPS Chairperson	ricketbr@northville.k12.mi.us
Mrs.	Lisa	Nemitz	Parent representative	ldnemitz@oaklandcc.edu
Mrs.	Sharon	Peterson	PTA President	irish_96@earthlink.net
Mrs.	Colette	Best	PTA Vice President	jimcolbest@all2easy.net
Mrs.	Kyria	Clark	PTA Secretary	kehclark@hotmail.com
Mr.	Jeff	Schade	Humanities Chairperson	schadeje@northville.k12.mi.us
Mrs.	Cathy	Galloway	Teachers Consultant and I	gallowca@northville.k12.mi.us
Ms.	Regan	Cowger	Teacher Consultant, IT me	cowgerre@northville.k12.mi.us
Mrs.	Amy	Morelli	Social worker and IT memb	morellam@northville.k12.mi.us
Mrs.	Megan	Holmes	School Psychologist and I	holmesme@northville.k12.mi.us
Ms.	Susan	Calderone	TSLI and IT member	caldersu@northville.k12.mi.us
Mrs.	Robin	Long	5th grade teacher and IT	longro@northville.k12.mi.us

Mrs.	Cori	Thomas	2nd grade teacher and IT	thomasco@northville.k12.mi.us
Mrs.	Jan	Purtell	Partnerships in Education	purtelja@northville.k12.mi.us

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

Coordination with Existing School Planning

School trends and overall school goals are developed by the School Improvement Team which consists of grade level chairpersons, Learning Consultant (Title I liaison) , humanities representative, parent representatives and the school principal. The team meets 4 times a year. Goal I of the current school improvement plan speaks directly to the identification, intervention programs, and monitoring for all students including Title I students. Progress reports are made at PTA meetings, District School Improvement Team meetings, and Board of Education meeting.

Title I and Regular Education Coordination

Grade level teams meet collegially twice a week to coordinate activities to meet school improvement goals. This includes the identification through data analysis of students in need. Amerman has an Intervention Team (IT) that provides intervention services to achieve Goal I and II of the school improvement plan. The IT consists of 2 Teacher Consultants, Speech Teacher, School Psychologist, Social Worker, Principal, Learning Consultant, and Classroom Teacher Representative. The IT meets weekly to review cases, monitor data, and provide Tier 2 intervention services: consultation, ELL services, diagnostic testing, hypothesis formation, differentiation, monitoring, recommendations for before school tutoring, summer school, and Title I. Teachers and parents may refer students to the IT for problems in any of the 4 core curriculum standards. One of the responsibilities of the social worker is to coordinate social services with our lunch program and outside agencies. They also meet to determine when and how to increase the frequency and intensity of interventions, set criteria for exit, and prioritize services. A member of the IT team is assigned as a liaison to each grade level collegial team. This IT model helps to coordinate resources and programs from regular education to Title I to Special Education. Early Childhood coordinates with Amerman in the transition of preschool students with a (1) evening parent meeting that describes the curriculum and program and (2) Kindergarten Round-up to screen students, provide feedback to parents, and begin the process of parent involvement. The Special Services Department coordinates transition services for identified at risk students in Early Childhood and the Elementary program.

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

In May of each school year the School Improvement Team analyzes cognitive/academic data (MEAP, ITBS, COGAT), psychomotor (Presidential Physical Fitness Test), and affective (attendance, discipline, self-efficacy survey, community and parent survey) data to determine needs, to recommend goals for programmatic improvement, to develop action plans, and to recommend professional development for the next school year.

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

School achievement data is placed on the Amerman web site. When Michigan Education Assessment Program (MEAP) and Iowa Test of Basic Skills (ITBS) data is received it is first presented to grade level collegial teams and analyzed. Both aggregate and disaggregated data is then presented at the following PTA meeting. All data is

placed on a common drive and Class A database for all teacher access and analysis.

Individual student progress is shared with parents in the following manner:

1. Parent reports of all standardized test data are sent home.
2. Title I- weekly parent packets.
3. Parent/Teacher Conferences are scheduled in November and April.
4. Report cards are sent home quarterly.
5. Class newsletters are sent home weekly.
6. Curriculum expectations are available on Amerman's web site.
7. Parent resources are available on Amerman's web site and in the parent library.
8. Translation services are available through the English Language Learner offices of the Special Services Department.

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.

Position of Contact:

Director of Human Resources

Address:

501 W. Main, Northville, MI 48167

Telephone Number:

248-344-8443

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

Conclusion

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

The following is Amerman's schedule of professional development for parapro's, certified staff, and parents:

Title One Paraprofessional Development Scheduled for 2009-2010

January 14, 2010

February 10, 2010

March 11, 2010

April 14, 2010

May 13, 2010

All workshops are 1 hour long. Topics will be developed from parapro surveys and will be adapted to the needs of paraprofessionals working directly with special needs students and be directed to Response to Intervention concepts.

Professional development for certified staff is coordinated with the Office of Instruction is based upon District School Improvement and building school improvement goals.

Certified Staff Professional Development Meetings Scheduled for 2009-2010

1. October 20- Class A Assessment System database by Datawise, Inc., 1 hour
2. November 3- Data driven dialogue/Data Analysis, 6 hours
3. November 5- Class A Assessment System database, part 2, 1 hour.
4. December 2- District school improvement, 6 hours
5. December 10- What students think in math, 1 hour.
6. January 15- United streaming, 1 hour.
7. February 18- Conferencing, 1 hour.
8. March 9- School improvement, spelling research, and conceptual versus procedural knowledge, 6 hours.
9. March 18- Microsoft Moviemaker, and its uses in writing.

An annual parent workshop is held in October to describe services including means of communication, resources available from the Learning Consultant and Parent Library, and techniques to work with students at home. At the end of each school year every parent receives a letter from next year's grade level team outlining suggested activities and several free educational materials are available in the lobby to "Fill the Summer." A list of free on-line resources are also made available to parent on the Amerman Website 24/7.

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

The district provides each school building with a school improvement budget to support meetings and professional development.

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

The Citizen/Staff Technology Committee makes recommendations to the Board of Education for recommended curriculum, technology uses, and alignment with MDE technology curriculum. At the elementary level students are taught key boarding, graphic design and presentation, and database/web resources for research. Technology application at Amerman include distance learning, word processing, spreadsheets, web research, computer presentations, computer generated movies, solar cars, and robotics.

Resources include 2 desktop stations per class, classroom sets of calculators, a video lab, a 34 station computer lab, and a 34 station portable wireless laptop lab.