



## Continuous Improvement Plan for Warren Consolidated Schools District



Districts electing not to utilize the MICIP Platform to develop a District Improvement Plan for the 2021-2022 school year must use this template and upload the completed document as part of their FY 2022 Consolidated Application in NexSys. In addition, the district must also complete and retain the Schoolwide and Targeted Template for all Title I, Part A schools.

When using this template, a district should follow the process and sequence outlined in the MICIP Process Guide, including using the considerations and guiding questions. Sample plans can also be found in the appendix of the Guide. The district will need to complete this document **for each new goal or for strategies and activities not previously part of an improvement plan.** The plan must include a description of programs to be funded through federal funds as part of the Consolidated Application. The district should disseminate to each building or program the goal(s), strategies and activities that apply to it.

For each section, note the documentation that is required; in some sections you are asked to answer specific questions while in others you are only asked to supply a summary of your team's discussion.

Submission Instructions: Follow the instructions on the attachments screen and upload the completed template(s) in NexSys in the Title I, Part A Attachments Section within the Consolidated Application. If the district does not receive or apply for Title I, Part A Funds, please upload the template(s) within the attachments section for one of the other federal or state funds for which the district is completing a Consolidated Application.

### **Contacts:**

Submission of the Consolidated Application: Your Regional Representative

Completing the Continuous Improvement Plan: Ben Boerkoel ([boerkoelb@michigan.gov](mailto:boerkoelb@michigan.gov))

MICIP Platform: Terry Nugent ([nugentt@michigan.gov](mailto:nugentt@michigan.gov))

# Assess Needs

**Identify the Area of Inquiry** - What area(s) will you explore?

We will explore achievement data through an equity lens.

**Discover Whole Child Data** - What data objects did you analyze, including academic, non-academic, and systems? **List the title of each data object and its source.**

## **Academic:**

MSTEP K-7, PSAT 8-10, SAT 11

NWEA MAP 1-8

Developmental Reading Assessment Second Edition (DRA2) K-5

Individual Reading Plans (IRPs) K-3

Failure rates 6-12

## **Non-Academic:**

Attendance K-12

Systems: PLC and MTSS

**Initial Data Analysis Summary** - What did the data tell you? What patterns and trends did you see across data objects? **Summarize your thinking.**

We analyzed demographic, achievement, and process data. Due to the pandemic, we had minimal perception data other than the choice of virtual or hybrid/in-person instruction from parents. Those numbers are also indicated in our demographic percentages. Data indicated a pattern of gaps across subgroups (Economically Disadvantaged, English Learner, Special Education, and Black students) in achievement, which increased as students progressed in grade levels. In addition, most recent data included subgroups for secondary failures, which showed skewed numbers in comparison to our demographics. We found a

trend that achievement results on state and local assessments decreased for all students in secondary as compared to elementary, with the subgroup gaps continuing to increase.

**Demographic Data:**

<b>2020-2021 Data</b>	<b>District</b>
Total students	12,971
Male	51.3%
Female	48.7%
White	64.4%
Asian	16.6%
Black	13.2%
Multi-Racial	3.6%
Special Education	12.4%
English Learners	25%
Economically Disadvantaged	67.4%
Hybrid/Face to Face	40.7%
Virtual Only	59.3%

**Achievement Data:**

<b>Grade Level</b>	<b>District</b>
<b>Literacy K-5</b>	<p><b>Fall 2020 Developmental Reading Assessment Second Edition (DRA2):</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 56.5% of grade 2 at intervention level</li> <li>• Gap between ED &amp; non-ED increased from 14% in K to 18%-21% in higher grades</li> <li>• Gap between EL &amp; non-EL increased from 9% in K to 41% in grade 5</li> <li>• Gap between Spec. Ed &amp; non-Spec. Ed increased from 2% in K to 37% in grade 5</li> <li>• Black students lowest scoring ethnicity across grade levels (ranging from 35.7% to 70.1% at intervention levels)</li> </ul>

**IRPs:**

- K=Fall 19 11%, Fall 20 8%
- 1<sup>st</sup>=Fall 19 2%, Fall 20 7%
- 2<sup>nd</sup>=Fall 19 8%, Fall 20 13%
- 3<sup>rd</sup>=Fall 19 23%, Fall 20 27%

3 year trend:

	<u>Kindergarten/TK</u>		<u>Grade 1</u>		<u>Grade 2</u>		<u>Grade 3</u>	
	<u>Count</u>	<u>%</u>	<u>Count</u>	<u>%</u>	<u>Count</u>	<u>%</u>	<u>Count</u>	<u>%</u>
<b>TOTAL IRPs</b>								
<b>2018-19</b>	85	9%	19	2%	77	8%	150	16%
<b>2019-20</b>	109	10%	14	2%	74	9%	186	20%
<b>2020-21</b>	80	8%	62	7%	116	13%	222	27%

**Math K-5****Fall 2020 NWEA Math:**

- Only 60% of grade 3-5 scored average or higher in math (40% below Average)
- Gaps of 40%-79% among ED, EL, Spec. Ed
- Black students lowest scoring ethnicity across grade levels (ranging from 11.7% in K to 62.9% below average by grade 5)

**Literacy 6-8****Fall 2020 NWEA Reading:**

- 62% of students Average or higher in grade 6 & grade 8 with 65% in grade 7
- Gaps of 40%-76% among ED, EL, Spec. Ed
- Black students lowest scoring ethnicity across grade levels (39-47% below average)

**2019 MSTEP Grade 6-7 ELA:**

- Overall 42% proficient in grade 6 and 43.3% proficient in grade 7
- EL lowest performing subgroup in ELA grade 6 (6.9% proficient)
- Spec. Ed lowest performing subgroup in ELA grade 7 (7.1% proficient)
- ED vs. non ED 44.1% gap in grade 6 ELA and 24.5% in grade 7 ELA

<p><b>Math 6-8</b></p>	<p><b>Fall 2020 NWEA MATH:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 53% average or higher grade 6, 51% in grade 7, 61% in grade 8</li> <li>• Gaps of 40%-88% among ED, EL, Spec. Ed</li> <li>• Black students lowest scoring ethnicity across grade levels (ranging from 40-50.5% below average)</li> </ul> <p><b>2019 MSTEP Grade 6-7 Math:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Overall 25.5% proficient in grade 6 and 43.3% proficient in grade 7</li> <li>• Spec. Ed lowest performing subgroup in grade 6 (7% proficient) &amp; grade 7 (2.7% proficient)</li> <li>• EL vs non-EL 27% gap in grade 6 &amp; 28% in grade 7</li> </ul>
<p><b>Literacy 9-12</b></p>	<p><b>2019 PSAT 9:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 39.2% met neither EBRW or math</li> <li>• 30% met both EBRW and math</li> <li>• Female &gt; males by 24.5 points in EBRW</li> </ul> <p><b>2019 PSAT 10</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 45.4% met neither EBRW or math</li> <li>• 22.6% met both EBRW and math</li> <li>• Female &gt; male by 31 points in EBRW</li> </ul> <p><b>2019 SAT 11</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 51.6% met neither EBRW or math</li> <li>• 23% met both EBRW and math</li> <li>• Black lowest scoring ethnicity (21.5 points lower than all students)</li> </ul>

3 Year Trend:

SAT 11 (Meeting Benchmark)			
School	Spr2017	Spr2018	Spr2019
Community	7	6	13
Cousino	63	62	55
Sterling Heights	53	53	46
Warren Mott	57	51	43
State	N/A	58	55

Data from MISchoolData, College Board, District Dashboard Spreadsheet

**Math 9-12**

**2019 PSAT 9:**

- 39.2% met neither EBRW or math
- 30% met both EBRW and math
- Female > male by 2.3 points in math

**2019 PSAT 10**

- 45.4% met neither EBRW or math
- 22.6% met both EBRW and math
- Female > male by 2.7 points in math

**2019 SAT 11**

- 51.6% met neither EBRW or math
- 23% met both EBRW and math
- Black lowest scoring ethnicity (21.5 points lower than all students)

3 Year Trend:

SAT 11 (Meeting Benchmark)			
School	Spr2017	Spr2018	Spr2019
Community	0	0	0
Cousino	26	34	33
Sterling Heights	30	26	25
Warren Mott	25	25	20
State	N/A	37	36

Data from MISchoolData, College Board, District Dashboard Spreadsheet

**Failure Data:**

<p><b>Failures 6-8</b></p>	<p><b>20-21 Semester 1 Failures:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Total course failures: 2,712</li> <li>• Males: 58.3%</li> <li>• Females: 41.7%</li> <li>• Black Students: 17.7%</li> <li>• Spec. Education: 18.2%</li> <li>• EL: 33%</li> <li>• ED: 82%</li> </ul>
<p><b>Failures 9-12</b></p>	<p><b>20-21 Semester 1 Failures:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Total course failures: 11,372</li> <li>• Males: 61.7%</li> <li>• Females: 38.3%</li> <li>• Black Students: 19.5%</li> <li>• Spec. Education: 15%</li> <li>• EL: 33.3%</li> <li>• ED: 72%</li> </ul>

**Attendance Data:**

<b>Attendance K-5</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• 4 of 12 elementary schools scored "above average" for attendance on state report card</li><li>• 8 of 12 elementary schools scores "significantly above average" for attendance on state report card</li></ul> <p><b>19-20 Attendance</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• K: 93.29%</li><li>• 1: 94.78%</li><li>• 2: 95.41%</li><li>• 3: 95.6%</li><li>• 4: 95.73%</li><li>• 5: 95.51%</li></ul>
<b>Attendance 6-8</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• 3 of 4 Middle Schools "below average" attendance on state report card</li></ul> <p><b>19-20 Attendance</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• 6: 94.36%</li><li>• 7: 93.33%</li><li>• 8: 92.97%</li></ul>
<b>Attendance 9-12</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• 3 High Schools "below average" or "significantly below average" attendance on state report card</li></ul> <p><b>19-20 Attendance</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• 9: 92.82%</li><li>• 10: 91.61%</li><li>• 11: 91.72%</li><li>• 12: 89.2%</li></ul>
<b>Subgroup Attendance K-12</b>	<p><b>19-20 Attendance</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• All 93.39%</li><li>• Asian 94.95%</li><li>• Black 91.79%</li><li>• Hispanic 93.25%</li><li>• White 93.4%</li></ul>



- |  |   |
|--|---|
|  | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>Gender:</b> no gap male/female 93.6% and 93.19%</li> <li>• <b>ED:</b> 92.9% vs. 94.51% non-ED (gap 1.6%)</li> <li>• <b>EL:</b> no gap (93.2 EL vs non-EL 93.45%)</li> <li>• <b>Spec Ed:</b> 91.62% vs non-Spec.Ed. 93.64% (gap 2%)</li> </ul> |
|--|---|

**Initial Initiative Inventory Analysis** - What have you already done to address the data? How well did that work? Consider the following questions and **summarize your thinking**.

1. What is the connection to the district mission?
2. What personnel are involved in the implementation?
3. What is the expected outcome?
4. What evidence for outcomes are there thus far?
5. What is the financial commitment and source of funding?
6. What fidelity measures exist?
7. What professional development exists, including coaches and performance feedback?

The mission of Warren Consolidated Schools, in partnership with families and community, is to achieve a level of excellence in teaching and learning which enables all students to become knowledgeable, productive, ethical, and successful citizens.

The vision of Warren Consolidated Schools is we're creating a collaborative culture of stakeholders committed to scholarship and creating success for our staff and students.

Our improvement connect to our mission for all students to be successful, especially with taking on the new equity and whole child lenses of MICIP. We will keep our mission and vision at the center of our planning to ensure we focus on results for all students and the involvement of all stakeholders in order to achieve success.

### **Steps to address the data thus far:**

#### **Elementary:**

English Language Arts: Currently, Tier I supports are job-embedded with the Curriculum Instructional Technology Specialists (CITS). Previous years' professional learning included literacy partner work with select teachers and grade level specific professional learning using the Benchmark Literacy Curriculum. The district continues to structure Tier II supports in literacy with district level literacy coaches. Coaches are assigned particular grade levels and support teachers through classroom

interventions. Tier III supports for English Learners (ELs) occur with Language Acquisition Teachers (LATs) with Direct Instruction programming determined by student need (WIDA data, oral literacy, local reading). Title I services are provided for literacy based on building programming resources. Special Education staff implemented Reading Mastery at various buildings as they piloted the program for students. To measure fidelity and monitor our work, the Early Literacy Coaches review intervention data, IRPs, NWEA MAP, and DRA2 scores to determine targeted focus areas for the following school year. LATs review intervention data, placement test data, and WIDA ACCESS data to determine services for the following year and monitor our work. This helps us evaluate the implementation as well.

Mathematics: Currently, Tier I supports are job-embedded with the Curriculum Instructional Technology Specialists (CITS). Previous years professional learning included number talks and math tasks. Tier III math interventions utilize Add+Vantage Math Recovery (AVMR) with district level MIRS coaches. Special Education staff implemented AVMR in their resource room support classes. MIRS Coaches continued to work with Title I teachers and have expanded to support Special Education Resource Room Teachers in utilizing the Tier II approach. To measure fidelity and monitor our work, the MIRS Coaches review intervention data, NWEA MAP scores to determine targeted focus areas for the following school year and to evaluate the implementation of the work.

### **Secondary:**

English Language Arts: Currently, Tier I supports are job-embedded with the Curriculum Instructional Technology Specialists (CITS). In our Middle Schools, Tier I professional learning included embedding writing and grammar into reading instruction. Each of our Middle Schools are Title I and offer ELA builder courses that include Corrective Reading Direct Instruction for decoding and Advanced Adolescent Reading Initiative (AARI) for comprehension supports. Tier III Supports also include Language Acquisition Teacher (LAT) pull-out instruction to support language development while connecting the core classroom content. Special Education staff provide supports in the resource room by implementing Corrective Reading as well as grade level content area goals in students' Individualized Educational Plans (IEPs). In our High Schools, Tier III supports are offered in ELA builder courses. This year we piloted a strategy-based ELA builder at our three main high schools that was modeled after AARI. At two of our High Schools, we continue to offer Language Acquisition Specialists (LAS). The LAS coaches work to support sheltered and general education core content teachers to better reach the needs of ELs in their Tier I classrooms. This initiative was implemented based on achievement and demographic data. The LAS initiative is reviewed every year as part of the Warren Consolidated Program Evaluation Tool and adjusted based on LAS survey results and EL student achievement data.

Mathematics: Currently, Tier I supports are job-embedded with the Curriculum Instructional Technology Specialists (CITS). In our Middle Schools, we are in our third year of piloting Illustrative Math curriculum. Illustrative Math includes a large language and vocabulary component and is a recommended best practice for English Learners, which is a large subgroup of our district. Professional learning opportunities have been provided to teachers as they learn this new approach to core instruction. Each of

our Middle Schools are Title I and offer math builder courses that utilize Add+Vantage Math Recovery (AVMR). Special Education staff implemented AVMR in their resource room support classes. MIRS Coaches continued to work with Title I teachers and have expanded to support Special Education Resource Room Teachers in utilizing the Tier II approach. We do not currently offer a district-level math builder at our high schools, however, prior to the pandemic, a pilot Tier III math builder course was offered at one of our high schools to align to Illustrative Math. The curriculum team is in the process of reviewing math curriculum to determine if Illustrative Math will be expanded into our high schools or if another approach will best fit our high school curriculum revision needs.

### **Professional Learning Communities (PLC):**

To address the area of Professional Learning Communities (PLC), the district-level specialists and coaches created an online PLC module course for teachers and a second course for administrators. This work led into the 2020-2021 school year. In previous years, select buildings attended PLC professional learning through the MISD with Dr. Tom Many from Solution Tree and local school improvement facilitators. Various teams across K-8 had begun the PLC process work but many had not continued the professional learning with fidelity. In addition, to address the equity focus of PLC and our need to improve the learning we provide to our subgroups, many building administrators and teams attend professional learning from Dr. Anthony Muhammad from Solution Tree. This was not a district-wide initiative, however, we have an intentional focus on this work for our three high schools in the future. In alignment to our PLC work, the district continues to create and improve our MTSS process that utilizes coaches, a MTSS facilitator and K-8 cycle meetings. A piloted Tier III course was implemented at our three high schools for the 2020-2021 school year but intentional long-term planning to expand MTSS into high school is still needed. In addition, our PLC monitoring are also included in our OCI and building administrator data dialogues through Thought Partner coaching as well as discussed at monthly data superintendent meetings.

### **Trauma-Informed and Resilient Schools:**

During the 2020-2021 school year, we piloted Trauma-Informed and Resilient School efforts to support the Whole Child. We have six district level trainers that include four administrators and two district level coaches. During pandemic, all building administrators (principals and assistant principals), elementary counselors, Literacy Coaches, MIRS coaches, LAS, and special Education support staff complete the Trauma-Informed and Resilient School professional development through partnering with the Macomb Intermediate School District. In addition, the six district trainers facilitated the Trauma-Informed and Resilient School Professional Development with four of our buildings and the Tier I district level Curriculum Instructional Technology Specialists (CITS). Work was evaluated using the participant surveys from the course and will be used for future coaching and planning of supports.

## **Social Emotional Learning (SEL):**

SEL was addressed through the creation of a district-wide committee to begin the work at the elementary and secondary level. A focus on mindset for teachers was implemented during the pandemic. In addition, elementary parent information and student activities were sent home to all elementary students in the spring and suicide prevention materials were sent home to all students in secondary grades.

## **Data:**

In preparation for MICIP, we have been revisiting our data collection calendar with the addition of an equity lens for subgroups. The MICIP template provided an opportunity to view failures and local assessment data (NWEA MAP and DRA2) from subgroup lens outside of the previously available Michigan school index that has included a subgroup lens for three years of summative (MSTEP and SAT) data.

**Create a Gap Statement** - How far are you from where you want to be? Identify the gap between your current reality and your desired state and **write the gap statement summary here.**

## **Gap Statements:**

1. Subgroup gaps (Economically Disadvantaged, English Learner, Special Education, and Black students) are increasing as students progress through grade levels.
2. Students in secondary are underperforming on summative assessments and failing classes.

## **Current Reality vs. Desired State:**

Our current reality shows the need for an intentional plan focused on improving achievement for subgroup students K-12 and a focus on secondary core instruction.

**Write a Data Story Summary** - What do you know regarding this area of inquiry? Consider these questions and **summarize your thinking**:

1. What strengths have been uncovered? What growth edges have been identified? What learner needs are going unmet or not being met adequately/sufficiently?
2. What district programs, supports and services are designated to meet student, classroom, leadership, and support priority growth target needs?
3. Are there any major challenges not being addressed by a service, program, or activity?
4. Are learners at the greatest risk receiving prevention programs, services, and supports? If not, why?
5. Are there duplicate services, programs, and supports attempting to address the same challenge? If so, which are more effective and which are less so?
6. Is there a braiding of funding across various programs and efforts?

**Strengths:**

Prior to the pandemic, we saw improvement in elementary ELA MSTEP (3-5) and NWEA scores (1-5) that aligned to our Tier II and Tier III literacy initiatives. Current data shows a need to refocus efforts on Tier 1 core instruction as gaps increase. Early predictions (as well as previous year analysis) predict low percentages of third graders being impacted by the retention of the Read by Grade Three Law. By fifth grade, we are seeing lower numbers (27.3%) scoring in the intervention level for our local reading DRA2 assessment.

In middle school, our strength is our 8<sup>th</sup> grade scores on the ELA portion of the PSAT. In the first year of the exam, our district scored above the 60% target.

Looking from an equity lens, our Asian students (including those who are English Learners) are typically outperforming White and All Students across ELA and Math in K-12.

**Challenges:**

The data showed gaps with our subgroups of ED, EL, Special Education, and Black students. Major challenges appear across the grade levels with gaps increasing as grade levels increase. For example, gap from lower elementary expanded as students moved towards fifth grade, middle school gaps increased, and high school gaps also increased with very low performance for all students on state assessments. While a previous strength from our elementary literacy efforts showed growth and closing of some gaps prior to the pandemic, however, we are seeing gaps expand with most recent data. ELA and math are both challenges at the high school level across Tier I all students and subgroups. In general, math is a challenge and growth area

across all grade levels, with significant challenges in the secondary grades. These data results indicate a need for a more intentional focus on PLC to reach all students.

### **Braiding of Funding:**

We coordinate general funds with state/federal grants to align to our initiatives. Title I (K-8 buildings), Section 41/Title III as appropriate for ELs, and 31A for at-risk supports. Tier II funding supports district-level support and PLC initiatives.

- K-5: Title II supports Curriculum Instructional Technology Specialist (CITS) for Tier 1 Core Content and 31A supports Tier II Literacy and Mathematics Coaches. General fund supplies Language Acquisition Teachers (LATs) for Tier III English Language Development (ELD) supports and Title I provides Tier III intervention for elementary schools (all twelve receive funding). 31A supports elementary counselors at targeted schools as well as our Transitional Kindergarten (TK) classrooms.
- 6-8: Title II supports Curriculum Instructional Technology Specialist (CITS) for Tier 1 Core Content and 31A supports Tier II Literacy and Mathematics Coaches who are beginning to work with targeted MS teams. General fund supplies Language Acquisition Teachers (LATs) for Tier III English Language Development (ELD) supports and Title I provides Tier III ELA and Mathematics intervention for middle schools (all four receive funding).
- 9-12: Title II supports Curriculum Instructional Technology Specialist (CITS) for Tier 1 Core Content and 31A and Section 41 support Tier II Literacy pilot courses at our three main high schools. General fund supplies Language Acquisition Teachers (LATs) with coordination from 31A for Tier III English Language Development (ELD) supports.

### **Analyze Root Cause - Why are things the way they are? Answer these questions:**

1. What tool(s) did you use to analyze root cause?
2. What root cause did you discover that is within your control and that you will address in your challenge statement?
3. What supporting documentation do you have?

[Five Whys Resource - NIRN](#)

[Fishbone Template](#)

## **We used the Five Whys Resource to analyze two challenge statements:**

1. Subgroup gaps (Economically disadvantaged, English Learner, Special Education, and Black students) are increasing as students progress through grade levels.

Root Cause: Lack of consistent Professional Learning Communities (PLC) implementation with building level accountability creates learning gaps within Tier 1 Core Instruction.

2. Students in secondary are underperforming on summative assessments and failing classes.

Root Cause: Lack of consistent implementation, monitored, and supported PLC processes at secondary level impedes the delivery of core instruction that is data-driven with a guaranteed and viable curriculum.

### **Supporting Documentation:**

MSTEP/PSAT/SAT scores, MI School Index with three years of subgroup data, failure rates for Fall Semester 2020 by subgroup level. In addition, PLC process data shows inconsistencies across buildings with misunderstandings of essential standards and commitment to guaranteed and viable curriculum

**Create a Challenge Statement – In one sentence**, what is the need or opportunity for growth you want to address? Consider writing an “If..., then...” statement.

If Professional Learning Communities (PLC) are not being implemented with fidelity, then the district should reflect on the foundations of PLCs. This refocus will involve coaching, Strategy Implementation Guides (SIGs), PLC Pathways, and a systemic approach to PLC district-wide.

## **Plan**

**Define a Measurable Goal** – What will you achieve? What is your SMART (Specific, Measurable, Attainable, Relevant, Time-bound) goal?

1. What is the name of the goal?
2. What is the due date for completion of this goal? (This date will also be your end target date.)

(See Process Guide for guidance.) **Write the SMART goal.**

**Goal: 60% of all students will be proficient in English Language Arts as exhibited on the MSTEP/PSAT/SAT by June 30, 2025.**

(Continuation literacy goal from 2019-2020 plan with the addition of SMART language)

Due Date: June 30, 2025

**Define End and Interim Target Measures** – How will you know if you achieved your goal? What is/are your end target(s) aligned to one of your data objects? By when will you accomplish this (see goal statement above)?

1. What targets will you measure along the way to ensure that you meet your end target(s)? On which dates?
2. Write the end target(s) and the related interim target(s).

**2019 Proficiency Grades 3-11 District Average: 46%**

**Interim Target Measures:**

**June 2022:** increase by 3.5% in grades 3-11 English Language Arts MSTEP/PSAT/SAT proficiency (49.5% proficient)

**June 2023:** increase by 3.5% in grades 3-11 English Language Arts MSTEP/PSAT/SAT proficiency (total increase of 7% from 2019 with 53% proficient)

**June 2024:** increase by 3.5% in grades 3-11 English Language Arts MSTEP/PSAT/SAT proficiency (total increase of 10.5% from 2019 with 56.5% proficient)

Interim Goals will also use NWEA local data to monitor growth of students scoring 41 percentile or above.

**End Goal:** increase by 3.5% in grades 3-11 English Language Arts MSTEP/PSAT proficiency (total increase of 14% by June 2025)

**Select a Strategy/Strategies and Identify Strategy Details** – What will you do to address the goal? **Answer the following questions:**

1. What is the identified strategy(ies)?
2. Who will be responsible for the strategy?
3. When will it start? When will it end?
4. Which schools/programs will implement it?



Use the [Hexagon tool](#) to assess each strategy; **summarize the results.**

**Strategy 1: (Continuation Goal-\*See 2019-2020/2020-2021 District Improvement Plan)**

**High Quality Tier I: District staff will engage in research-based professional learning to implement quality literacy instruction across the curriculum through job-embedded and support model.**

Responsible Party: OCI, Administrators, and Building Staff

Start: July 1, 2021

End: June 30, 2025

Schools/Programs: All Schools and District Programs

**Strategy 2: (Continuation Goal-\*See 2019-2020/2020-2021 District Improvement Plan)**

**MTSS: Staff will develop, implement, monitor, and evaluate the impact of a Multi-tiered System of Support (MTSS) process and the delivery of Tier II and III interventions on students' behavioral and academic success.**

Responsible Party: OCI, Administrators, and Building Staff

Start: July 1, 2021

End: June 30, 2025

Schools/Programs: All Schools and District Programs

### **Strategy 3: (Continuation Goal-\*See 2019-2020/2020-2021 District Improvement Plan)**

**Professional Learning Communities (PLC): Staff will collaborate as a professional learning community to strengthen the vertical and horizontal alignment between curriculum, instruction, and assessment practices in all core and elective content areas using the PLC framework 1. Focus on Learning, 2. Collaborative Culture, 3. Results Orientation**

Responsible Party: OCI, Administrators, and Building Staff

Start: July 1, 2021

End: June 30, 2025

Schools/Programs: All Schools and District Programs

**Identify Activities** - What will you do to implement and monitor the strategy(ies)? (See the MICIP Process Guide for considerations.) **Answer the following questions for each activity:**

1. Who will be responsible for it?
2. When will it start? What is the due date?

### **Strategy 1: No New Activities (continuation from previous plan)**

#### **Strategy 2 New Activities:**

**New Activity 1:** Performance Matters Intervention Professional Development and Coaching (Getting Ready)

Responsible Party: OCI and Building Staff

Start: July 1, 2021

End: June 30, 2025

**New Activity 2:** Utilization of Performance Matters Intervention throughout the MTSS Process (Implement)

Responsible Party: OCI and Building Staff

Start: July 1, 2021

End: June 30, 2025

**New Activity 3:** Review of Progress Monitoring Data within Performance Matters Intervention (Monitor)

Responsible Party: OCI, MTSS Team, Administrators, and Building Staff

Start: July 1, 2021 (Quarterly)

End: June 30, 2025

**New Activity 4:** Analysis of NWEA MAP, DRA2, MSTEP, IRP Data (Evaluate)

Responsible Party: OCI and Building Staff

Start: July 1, 2021

End: June 30, 2025

**New Activity 5:** High School Advanced Adolescent Reading Initiative (AARI) Professional Development and Coaching (Getting Ready)

Responsible Party: OCI Staff, Administrators, and High School Interventionists

Start: July 1, 2021

End: June 30, 2025

**New Activity 6:** Teaching of High School Advanced Adolescent Reading Initiative (AARI) in ELA Builder Semester Course (Implement)

Responsible Party: OCI Staff, Administrators, and High School Interventionists

Start: July 1, 2021

End: June 30, 2025

**New Activity 7:** High School AARI Qualitative Reading Inventory (QRI) Data Review (Monitor)

Responsible Party: OCI Staff, Administrators, and High School Interventionists

Start: July 1, 2021

End: June 30, 2025

**New Activity 8:** Building Administrator Walk throughs of AARI ELA Builder Semester Course (Monitor)

Responsible Party: Administrators

Start: July 1, 2021 (Monthly)

End: June 30, 2025

**New Activity 9:** Analysis of High School AARI Qualitative Reading Inventory (QRI) Data and NWEA MAP Review (Evaluate)

Responsible Party: OCI Staff, Administrators, and High School Interventionists

Start: July 1, 2021

End: June 30, 2025

**New Activity 10:** English Learners (ELs) with Suspected Disabilities District Team Professional Learning and Coaching (Getting Ready)

Responsible Party: OCI Administrators, District Team (includes selected Special Education and Language Acquisition Staff)

Start: July 1, 2021

End: June 30, 2022

**New Activity 11:** English Learners (ELs) with Suspected Disabilities District Team Preliminary Protocol Development Assessment Pilot (Getting Ready)

Responsible Party: OCI Administrators, District Team (includes selected Special Education and Language Acquisition Staff)

Start: July 1, 2021

End: June 30, 2022

**New Activity 12:** Review of Pilot Assessment Data and Protocol Feedback (Getting Ready)

Responsible Party: OCI Administrators, District Team (includes selected Special Education and Language Acquisition Staff)

Start: July 1, 2021

End: June 30, 2022

**New Activity 13:** Analysis of Special Education Referrals for English Learners vs. Non-English Learners (Getting Ready)

Responsible Party: OCI Staff, District Team, Administrators and Building Staff

Start: July 1, 2021

End: June 30, 2022

**New Activity 14:** Development of Protocol for English Learners (ELs) with Suspected Disabilities (Getting Ready and Implement)

Responsible Party: OCI Staff, District Team, Administrators and Building Staff

Start: July 1, 2021

End: June 30, 2022

**New Activity 15:** District Level Trainers for Trauma Informed and Resilient Schools (TIRS) through Starr Commonwealth (Getting Ready and Implement)

Responsible Party: District Level Trainers (6)

Start: July 1, 2021

End: June 30, 2025

**New Activity 16:** Trauma-Informed and Resilient Schools (TIRS) Professional Development for Staff (Getting Ready and Implement)

Responsible Party: District Trainer Team, OCI Staff, Support Staff, Administrators, and Building Staff

Start: July 1, 2021

End: June 30, 2025

**New Activity 17:** Continued support of Trauma-Informed and Resilient Schools (TIRS) Strategies through District supported Schoology Course (Implement)

Responsible Party: District Trainer Team, Administrators and Building Staff

Start: July 1, 2021

End: June 30, 2025

**New Activity 18:** Review of Trauma-Informed and Resilient Schools (TIRS) Evidence during Administrator Walkthroughs, Thought Partner Coaching, and Building Continuous Improvement Plans (Implement and Monitor)

Responsible Party: District Trainer Team, Administrators and Building Staff

Start: July 1, 2021

End: June 30, 2025

**New Activity 19:** Analysis of Trauma-Informed and Resilient Schools (TIRS) Schoology Course Usage and Feedback on Implementation of Strategies (Implement and Monitor)

Responsible Party: District Trainer Team, Administrators and Building Staff

Start: July 1, 2021

End: June 30, 2025

**New Activity 20:** Review of Data (student referrals, local achievement data, attendance, etc.) with Trauma-Informed and Resilient Lens for Impact on School Culture and Achievement (Evaluate)

Responsible Party: District Trainer Team, Administrators and Building Staff

Start: July 1, 2021

End: June 30, 2025



**New Activity 21:** Review of Survey Data for Trauma-Informed and Resilient Schools (TIRS) Professional Development and Ongoing Implementation Feedback from Previous Cohorts (Evaluate)

Responsible Party: District Trainer Team

Start: July 1, 2021

End: June 30, 2025

**Strategy 3 New Activities:**

**New Activity 1:** Administrator Professional Learning Communities (PLC) Professional Development (Getting Ready)

Responsible Party: OCI Staff and Administrators

Start: July 1, 2021

End: June 30, 2022

**New Activity 2:** Collaborative Coaches Network Professional Development and Coaching (Getting Ready and Implement)

Responsible Party: OCI Staff and Language Acquisition Specialists

Start: July 1, 2021

End: June 30, 2025

**New Activity 3:** Flashback, Look Forward Essential Standards Review (Getting Ready and Implement)

Responsible Party: OCI Staff, Administrators, and Building Staff

Start: July 1, 2021

End: June 30, 2025

**New Activity 4:** Administrator Professional Learning Communities (PLC) Coaching and Thought Partners (Implement)

Responsible Party: OCI Staff and Administrators

Start: July 1, 2021

End: June 30, 2025

**New Activity 5:** Professional Learning Communities (PLC) Review and Feedback of PLC Essential Elements, PLC Team Agendas, Common Formative Assessment (CFA) Data (Monitor)

Responsible Party: OCI Staff, Administrators, and Building Staff

Start: July 1, 2021

End: June 30, 2025

**New Activity 6:** Review and Feedback of Monthly Superintendent Meeting Data (Monitor)

Responsible Party: OCI Staff and Administrators

Start: July 1, 2021

End: June 30, 2025

**New Activity 7:** Analysis of Monthly Superintendent Meeting Data (Monitor)

Responsible Party: OCI Staff and Administrators

Start: July 1, 2021

End: June 30, 2025

**New Activity 8:** Analysis of NWEA MAP, PSAT 9/10, SAT 11 Data (Evaluate)

Responsible Party: OCI Staff and Administrators

Start: July 1, 2021

End: June 30, 2025

**New Activity 9:** Analysis of NWEA MAP, PSAT 9/10, SAT 11 Data (Evaluate)

Responsible Party: OCI Staff and Administrators

Start: July 1, 2021

End: June 30, 2025

**New Activity 10:** Equity Audit with Dr. Anthony Muhammad (Getting Ready)

Responsible Party: OCI Staff, Administrators, and High School Building Staff

Start: July 1, 2021

End: June 30, 2022

**New Activity 11:** Equity Audit Results Review and Feedback Dr. Anthony Muhammad (Getting Ready)

Responsible Party: OCI Staff, Administrators, and High School Building Staff

Start: July 1, 2021

End: June 30, 2022

**New Activity 12:** Equity Professional Development and Coaching with Dr. Anthony Muhammad (Implement)

Responsible Party: OCI Staff, Administrators, Building Equity Coalition Team, and Building Staff

Start: July 1, 2021

End: June 30, 2022

**New Activity 13:** Equity Lens to Building Data (CFAs, failure rates) Review and PLC integration of Equity Audit Results Review and Feedback (Monitor)

Responsible Party: OCI Staff, Administrators, Building Equity Coalition Team, and Building Staff

Start: July 1, 2021

End: June 30, 2025

**New Activity 14:** Analysis of NWEA MAP, PSAT 9/10, SAT 11 Data from Equity Lens (Evaluate)

Responsible Party: OCI Staff, Administrators, Building Equity Coalition Team, and Building Staff

Start: July 1, 2021

End: June 30, 2025

**Select Strategy Funding Options – How will you pay for the strategy/activities? Answer the following questions:**

1. What is the total cost over the life of the strategy?
2. What are the sources of funds, including federal, state, and local?

(Exact amounts for each funding source are identified in NexSys.)

**Strategy 1 Total Cost:**

- Continuation Goal \*See 2019-2020/2020-2021 District Improvement Plan
- Multiple staff salaries and benefits (exact amounts are identified in NexSys, MEGS+, and/or general ledger as appropriate to source).
- Additional supplies and fees approximately \$8,000

**Strategy 1 Funding Sources:**

- Continuation Goal \*See 2019-2020/2020-2021 District Improvement Plan
- General Fund (WCS Staff)
- Title II/IV (OCI Staff)
- May also be supported with ESSER funds pending additional planning and further grant coordination to maximize funding impact

**Strategy 2 Total Cost:**

- Multiple staff salaries and benefits (exact amounts are identified in NexSys, MEGS+, and/or general ledger as appropriate to source).
- Additional supplies and fees approximately \$150,000

**Strategy 2 Funding Sources:**

- Title I/II/III/IV (OCI Staff, Intervention Staff, fees, supplies)
- 31A/Section 41 (Intervention Staff, fees, supplies)
- General Fund (OCI and District Staff)
- May also be supported with ESSER funds pending planning and further grant coordination to maximize funding impact

### **Strategy 3 Total Cost:**

- Multiple staff salaries and benefits (exact amounts are identified in NexSys, MEGS+, and/or general ledger as appropriate to source).
- Additional supplies and fees approximately \$70,000

### **Strategy 3 Funding Sources:**

- General Fund (Administrators)
- Title I/II/III/IV (OCI Staff, Intervention Staff, fees, supplies)
- 31A/Section 41 (OCI Staff, Intervention Staff, fees, supplies)
- Regional Assistance Grant (RAG) (fees, supplies)
- May also be supported with ESSER funds pending planning and further grant coordination to maximize funding impact

### **Plan for Strategy Communication – Answer the following questions:**

1. To whom will you communicate your plan? Which parts of it?
2. How will you communicate it?

### **Communication Plan:**

The new activities under the each strategy as well as the district professional development plan will be shared with all buildings to demonstrate how district initiatives all align to the District Improvement Plan.

**Who:** Superintendent, OCI staff, building Administrators, Building Staff, Board of Education, Parents and Students.

**How:** Communication of District Improvement Plan will be shared with the Board of Education for approval. OCI staff will communicate plan with Building Administrators and staff. Building Administrators will communicate their implementation of the District Improvement Plan as indicated in the monitoring strategies, particularly through building walk throughs, thought partner coaching and monthly superintendent data meetings. Communication to stakeholders (parents and students) will occur through perception data.

## Requirements for programs requesting federal funds and where they can be met in the MICIP process.

- Comprehensive Needs Assessment
  - Sections 1112(b)(1), 1112(b)(4), 2102(b)(2)(C), 2102(b)(2)(D), 4106(d), and 4106(e)(2);
  - MICIP – Initial Data Analysis Summary, Initial Initiative Inventory Analysis, Create a Gap Statement, Create a Data Story Summary
- High Quality Instruction and Supports for All Students
  - Sections 1112(b)(1)(A), 1112(b)(1)(D), 1112(b)(13), 1112(c)(7), and 4106(e)(1)(B)-(D);
  - MICIP – Select a Strategy/Strategies and Identify Strategy Details, Identify Activities
- Identification and Monitoring of High Need Students
  - Sections 1112(b)(6), 1112(b)(9), 1112(b)(1)(B), 1112(c)(1), and 1306(a)(1)(B)(i)
  - MICIP – Discover Whole Child Data, Select a Strategy, Identify Strategy Details, Identify Activities
- Services to High Need Students
  - Sections 1112(b)(1)(C), 1112(b)(5)-(6), 1112(b)(11), 1306(a)(1)(C), 1423(1)-(2) and 3116(b)(1)-(2)
  - MICIP – Select a Strategy and Identify Strategy Details
- Coordination, Integration, and Transitions
  - Section 1112(a)(1)(B), 1112(b)(8), 1112(b)(10), 1112(b)(12), 1112(c)(4)-(5), 1306(a)(1)(A), 1306(a)(1)(F)-(G), 1423(3)-(6), 1423(9)-(13) and 3116(b)(4)(D)
  - MICIP – Identify Activities
- Instruction by Effective, Qualified, and Licensed Staff
  - Sections 1112(b)(2), 1112(c)(6), 1112(e)(1), and 3116(c); [MCL 380.1231](#)
  - MICIP - Data Story, Define a Measurable Goal, Identify Strategy Details, Identify Activities
- High Quality and Ongoing Professional Learning
  - Sections 2102(b)(2)(A)-(B), 2102(b)(2)(F), and 8101(42); [MCL 380.1527](#) and [MCL 380.1526](#)
  - MICIP – Identify Strategy Details, Identify Activities
- Strategies to Increase Parental and Family Engagement
  - Sections 1112(b)(7), 1112(e), 1116(b)-(f), 1423(8) and 3116(b)(3)-(4)
  - MICIP – Data Story, Define a Measurable Goal, Identify Strategy Details, Identify Activities
- Additional Descriptions and Assurances
  - Sections 1112(b)(3), 1112(b)(4), 1112(b)(13), 1112(c)(2), 2102(b)(2)(E), 1423(7), and 4106(e)(1)(A)
  - MICIP - Data Story, Define a Measurable Goal, Identify Strategy Details, Identify Activities
- Program Development, Review and Revision
  - Sections 1112(a)(1)(A), 1112(a)(5), 1306(a)(1)(B)(ii), 1306(a)(1)(D), 1306(a)(2)(B), 2102(b)(2)(D), 3116(b)(4)(C), and 8538; [MCL 380.1277 \(2\)\(c\) and \(1\)](#)
  - MICIP - Monitor and Adjust Plans



# Requirements for the State of Michigan Revised School Code Act 451 of 1976, Section 380.1277, and where they can be met in the MICIP Process

- Mission statement
  - MICIP – Setting the Stage
- Goals based on student academic objectives for all students; curriculum alignment corresponding to those goals; strategies to accomplish the goals
  - MICIP – Define a Measurable Goal, Select Strategy/Strategies and Identify Strategy Details, Identify Activities
- Evaluation processes
  - MICIP - Monitor and Adjust Plans, Evaluate Goals
- Staff development
  - MICIP – Identify Activities
- Development and utilization of community resources and volunteers; the role of adult and community education, libraries and community colleges in the learning community
  - MICIP – Identify Activities, Fund the Strategy
- Development of alternative measures of assessment that will provide authentic assessment of pupils' achievements, skills, and competencies.
  - MICIP – Define End and Target Measures, Identify Activities
- Methods for effective use of technology as a way of improving learning and delivery of services and for integration of evolving technology in the curriculum.
  - MICIP – Identify Activities
- Ways to make available in as many fields as practicable opportunities for structured on-the-job learning, such as apprenticeships and internships that involve active, direct, and hands-on learning, combined with classroom instruction that enhances a pupil's employability, including, but not limited to, instruction relating to problem solving, personal management, organizational and negotiation skills, and teamwork.
  - MICIP – Identify Activities
- A requirement that each school operated by the school district provide to pupils a variety of age-appropriate career informational resources in grades K to 12 and an opportunity to do each of the following: During grade levels that the board of the school district considers appropriate, complete 1 or more experiences in a field of a pupil's interests or aptitude and participate in a follow-up process that provides the pupil with sufficient reflection of those experiences. During grades K to 12, discuss career interests, options, and preparations with a school counselor or as considered appropriate by the board of the school district, another knowledgeable adult.
  - MICIP – Identify Activities
- Programs that will provide pupils in grades 6 to 12 work-based learning activities that ensure those pupils make connections with workers or experts in a variety of fields. Programs or instruction that ensure every pupil in grade 12 knows how to develop and use a resume, letter of reference, school record, and talent portfolio.
  - MICIP – Identify Activities