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**Introduction**

Children who are proficient in reading and writing fare better in the secondary classroom, have a better chance of college admission and a broader choice of career paths beyond college.   According to Feister (2013), students who are proficient readers by the end of third grade are more likely to graduate from high school and have economic success as adults. While students who are not proficient by the end of third grade are four times more likely to drop-out of high school before graduating.  Proficiency in writing also plays an integral role in students success beyond elementary school.  Because written communication is increasingly being used to assess performance during a person’s academic time and beyond, poor writing communication skills can have a negative impact on success in college and career (Puranik, Otaiba, Folsom Sidler & Greulich, 2014).  The goals set forth in this Action Plan have been developed to increase reading and writing proficiency in alignment with the Common Core State Standards (CCSS).

Literacy instructional strategies must be based on a sound theoretical framework and proven pedagogical strategies to provide the optimal level of instruction for the students.  The CCSS were designed to make certain that students who graduate from high school are prepared for collegiate programs or to enter the workforce (Common Core, 2015).  The CCSS for English Language Arts and Literacy require students to interact regularly with complex texts that increase in difficulty from grade to grade, compels them to read carefully to understand and use textual information in their own writing, and necessitates a concentration on nonfiction to build knowledge independently through reading and writing (Common Core, 2015).  To meet these rigorous standards it is important to determine a student’s current academic levels, provide instruction that challenges them at this level and provides the supports for them to move to the next level.

This plan proposes the use of Vygotsky’s Zone of Proximal Development (ZPD) to meet these aims.  The ZPD is the difference between what a student can do independently and what they can do with assistance or scaffolds.  The scaffolds are gradually removed as the student masters the learning objective (Rezaee & Azizi, 2012).  Further, Vygotsky’s Social Development Theory stresses that an individual’s development cannot be understood without considering the social and cultural context of which they are a part.  Therefore this Action Plan integrates technology that aids in the identifying children’s ZPD, provides technology to scaffold instruction and incorporates parental involvement to address social and cultural aspects of student development.

**General Education**

Today’s classrooms are a diverse mix of student populations including students with special needs, English language learners, gifted students, and at-risk students where all learners are supposed to attain the curricular objectives (Voltz, Sims, & Nelson, 2010). To meet the literacy needs of today's students and the requirements of the Common Core State Standards, it is necessary to integrate technology into the elementary classroom thoughtfully and systematically. In order for students to achieve at optimal levels during literacy instruction students should be presented with tasks that are just beyond their current abilities or their ZPD.  The ZPD for each student varies by individual and skill and changes as students gain understanding (Belolan, 2013).  Therefore assessment of student’s reading abilities and levels will be completed three times throughout the year utilizing the *Reading Street Common Core* baseline assessment through the Realize learning management system.  A baseline assessment will be administered in September to determine students’ instructional needs and the *Reading Street Common Core* program will provide a personalized, skills based reading instructional plan for each student.

The *Reading Street Common Core* technology platform incorporates the tenets of the CCSS in that it provides text complexity in reading, balances fiction and nonfiction texts, and focuses on informative, argumentative, and narrative writing (Pearson, 2015).  According to a study completed by Ladnier-Hicks, McNeese, and Johnson (2010) third graders that took part in the first year of implementation of the *Reading Street Common Core* program showed improvement in reading performance. *Reading Street Common Core* provides personalized reports for each student and offers strategies for scaffolding through mentor texts and on-going assessment.  Scaffolded support is provided to students reading at, below, and above grade level through differentiated lesson alternatives and Success Tracker, an online data management system that provides diagnostic prescriptions for teacher implementation (Pearson, 2015).  Online leveled readers can be accessed by students and assigned by teachers through a searchable leveled reader database.  Teachers can use the database to e-mail both the readers and assignments to students (Pearson, 2015).

**Struggling Readers**

In order for students to be successful in college, career, or life, they must be able to understand complex texts across content areas (Common Core State Standards Initiative, 2015a).  However, students often enter college “without the learning, critical thinking, and literacy skills they need to succeed in higher education” (McDaniel, 2014).  Even more startling is that 63% of students who are low, not proficient, or below basic in reading by third grade do not graduate from high school (Hernandez, 2012).  Students identified with disabilities or who are at risk for learning disabilities often struggle to read.  The future for struggling readers is bleak unless intervention strategies are implemented to support students’ learning goals.

Struggling readers find reading or learning to read especially challenging.  These students may have a learning disability and receive instruction in a special education class or they may receive remedial instruction through a Response to Intervention program.  Technology can be instrumental in supporting struggling readers though digital scaffolding.  With the click of a mouse or touch of a screen, struggling readers can access the pronunciation of unfamiliar words, simplified wordings, second language translations, or American Sign Language pop-ups (McKenna, 2014) to overcome barriers to reading.

To meet the goal of supporting struggling readers who scored below 60 on the September administration of a baseline assessment, online intervention programs that focus on the five components of reading (phonemic awareness, phonics, fluency, comprehension, vocabulary) were selected.  In some programs, technology is used as the main source of instruction; in others, technology is supplemental to the program.

Personalized learning programs such as *Reading Street Common Core* (Pearson, 2015a) are consistent with Vygotsky’s zone of proximal development (McLeod, 2012) in that they scaffold instruction to students’ ability.  *Reading Street Common Core’s* strategic intervention involves intensive, targeted instruction, scaffolding, practice with critical skills, opportunities for students to respond as well as conceptually coherent, multi–modal, and leveled materials, including decodable readers, leveled readers, picture word cards, alphabet cards, phonics songs and rhymes (Pearson, 2011).

Compass Learning’s *Pathblazer* program personalizes instruction for targeted instruction (Compass Learning, 2015) through a personalized learning path for each student that is mapped out specifically to address highlighted gaps.  This program provides scaffolding and non-repetitive re-teaching lessons in each learning activity.  In addition, *Pathblazer* provides actionable data that is generated in its reporting functions which allow for real-time instructional adjustments.

A personalized literacy program, *myON* (Capstone, 2013), provides access to over 4,000 enhanced digital books, including fiction, nonfiction, and Spanish language titles.  In this reader-centered program, students are given choice not only in book title, but also in where and when they want to read since the program is accessible anytime, anywhere.  Moreover, the home-school connection is strengthened as students are encouraged to spend time with family reading and learning together.

Struggling readers need to experience success in reading, and with personalized digital learning interventions that meet their individual needs, students will be supported as they move closer to achieving reading proficiency.

**Parental Involvement**

The more parents are involved in their child’s early literacy development, the more success the child will experience.  “Parental involvement in early literacy is directly connected to academic achievement” (Burton, 2013, n.p.).  Parents may not participate in their child’s learning activities because they may feel inadequate, or they may not meet with teachers because they may fear a negative report about their child (Ganske, Monroe, & Strickland, 2003).

Technology can bridge the gap between home-school communications and can encourage reluctant parents to become actively involved in their child’s literacy achievement.  Teachers can develop timely videotaped messages for students in their classes or grade level.  These messages can give parents an update on activities students are involved in, projects students are working on, and books students are reading.  Teachers can make suggestions as to how parents can support their child.  For example, when students are reading a particular genre, teachers can provide parents with types of questions to ask or give related website links.  Teachers can demonstrate how to access online learning resources such as *myON*.  Teachers can also model how to foster literacy activities such as shared reading, word study, or writing (Ganske et al., 2003).  Digital messages from teachers can be posted on a class website or they can be emailed to parents.

Not only should schools take the lead in inviting parents to become involved in their child’s academic success, but they should also support parents who are concerned but do not know how to take action.

**Professional Development**

Faculty professional development is an integral component to the successful implementation of any district-wide program.  Frazier (2012) asserts “a successful professional development program allows a school district to prepare teachers (and, in turn, students) to use technology as a natural part of the curriculum” (p. 52).  For a professional development (PD) program to be effective the focus should be on the broader goal of improving student learning not on teaching educators how to use technology tools.  A professional development program must also be intentionally tied to the district’s technology plan and acknowledge the skills and knowledge educators already have (Frazier, 2012).   To tie PD to the technology plan and begin the task of collecting data on faculty’s level of knowledge and skills with technology a PD committee will be instated with the charge of developing an ongoing program for technology integration.  Much like student learning being enhanced  through the identification of individual’s ZPD, the PD committee should use a survey to determine the knowledge, skills, and needs of the district staff or the their ZPD.  It is a waste of time and money for teachers to be sitting through a lesson about a technique they are familiar with or conversely spending time in a class about a technique that is far above their skill base.  A survey tool that Frazier (2012) recommends, for self- assessment of technology skills is ProfilerPro online survey tool.  The PD committee will use this tool to determine the PD needs of the district’s professional staff.

Another area to address in PD for successful integration of technology is the inclusion best practices for continuing education.  For example, when professional development is sustained and includes curriculum connections, participant interaction, and the necessary resources, teaching practices are more likely to change (Fogle, 2014).  To sustain interaction of participants beyond the training workshop, collaboration between professional should be encouraged and fostered.  A professional learning community (PLC) can significantly increase the rate at which teachers implement new strategies (Fogle, 2014).  This action plan will include the development of PLC’s that meet once a month to develop lessons, share strategies, see successes in their colleagues’ classrooms while building a confidence to integrate technology (Fogle, 2014).  The PLC’s will utilize the Google platform to collaborate and collect ideas, i.e. Google docs, Google Hangouts, and Google Plus.  Frazier (2012) also recommends that a variety of learning experiences and interventions in different formats be utilized to ensure the success of the PD program but more importantly to ensure the integration of technology for student success.  Therefore the PD Committee will develop training opportunities in the form of classes, collaborative projects (PLC), and web based options.

**Writing Across the Grade Levels**

Since the inception of the Common Core State Standards, districts have seen a difference in the manner in which writing is introduced and scaffolded within the curriculum.  Now, more than ever, there is a demand for increased rigor and alignment to the standards.  The major shifts in English Language Arts that are evident as a result of the Common Core Standards in ELA include 1) regular practice with complex texts and academic language; 2) reading, writing and speaking grounded in evidence from the text, both literary and informational; 3) building knowledge through content-rich nonfiction (Achieve the Core, 2015).  In addition, the Common Core places great emphasis on three writing types which include Informative/Explanatory, Narrative and Argument/Opinion.  It also focuses on having students use evidence from the text to support their writing.  The Common Core also requires narrative writing throughout the grades with a greater command of sequence and detail in the later grades for the purposes of argumentative and informational writing.

In order to prepare students for the increased rigor of the Common Core it is essential to provide students with the explicit scaffolding needed to support the writing process.  Writing instruction should include opportunities for explicit teaching in which the teacher provides direct instruction by modelling the process while stepping back to encourage students to problem solve while writing (Englert, Mariage & Dunsmore, 2006) as cited in Gibson, S.  Flexible groupings should be formed based on formative and summative writing assessments.  During the writer’s workshop, the teacher should work closely with each of the members of the group in order to provide high levels of immediate targeted support.  Instructional tools such as the use of document camera can be a quite beneficial when sharing authentic writing samples with students during the writer’s workshop or introducing a mentor text.

At the end of each quarter, all students in grades K-8 will complete a writing prompt aligned to the Common Core State Standards.  The students will be assessed using a district rubric aligned to the standards to determine student growth.  Based on the findings, the classroom teacher will create flexible groupings in an effort to personalize the instruction during the writer’s workshop block.  This practice will be modeled in general education classroom, special needs classrooms and classrooms that service English language learners.

Students across all grade levels will have vast opportunities to share their writing experiences using a variety of technology resources. Struggling learners and English Language Learners will also have the ability to animate their thinking using Explain Everything.  Explain Everything is unique interactive screencasting whiteboard app which has the ability to record voice for presentations this is an ideal feature for diverse learners.  Google Docs can be used to create online writing pieces.  In doing so, it will prepare students with the technology skills needed for college and career readiness found in the Partnership for Assessment of Readiness for College and Careers (PARCC).  Additional tools such as Microsoft PowerPoint Software can support writers when interpreting poetry and using multimodal presentations.  Online discussion boards and blogs will also engage students in asynchronous discussions.   Class wikis can also be used to write and edit information about novels and literature.

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Action Plan** | | | | | | | |
| **School: Principal: Date Submitted**: | | | | | | | |
| Section A –Describe your goal, target audience, and identify which need(s) the goal addresses. (Refer to prior data analysis regarding needs) | | | | | | | |
| **Goal #1** | | By June 2017, reading instruction and remediation will be provided to students who scored above 60 on the September administration of the Reading Street Common Core baseline assessment and 80% of those students receiving literacy interventions will receive passing grades in reading (year-end average). | | | | | |
| **Target Audience** | | All students receiving English language arts instruction in the general education classroom. | | | | | |
| **Identified Needs** | | The CCSS for English Language Arts and Literacy require students to interact regularly with complex texts that increase in difficulty from grade to grade, compels them to read carefully to understand and use textual information in their own writing, and necessitates a concentration on nonfiction to build knowledge independently through reading and writing (Common Core, 2015). | | | | | |
| **Outcomes/Objectives**  **Section B-**  **The outcomes must be measureable and directly aligned to Goal. This outcome/objective must be one of your technology related outcomes/objectives from Project #4 for this Goal** | **ACTION STEPS** – Section C – Descriptively list the action to ensure progress toward your goal. Action steps are strategies and interventions which should be research-based where possible and may *include professional development, technology, communication, and parent and community involvement initiatives within the action steps.(Use as many steps as you need for each Outcome)* | **IMPLEMENTATION INFORMATION** | | | | | |
| Section D– For each of the Action Steps you list, give timeline, person(s) responsible (for management, coordination and monitoring), required resources (infrastructure- services, physical and human resources),projected cost(s)/funding sources, evaluation data source with identified instrument/methodology, and principal strategies and responsibilities. (For Evaluation Strategy, define how you will evaluate the action step.) | | | | | |
| Timeline  (begin-end date for each step) | Person Responsible for coordination and reporting – point person | Required Resources  (People, technology, furniture, etc.) | Estimated Projected Cost(s) and Funding Sources | Evaluation Data Source and Instruments used | Principal’s Strategies and Responsibilities to insure success for each step |
| Outcome/Objective #1- IN THIS BOX - this outcome is only related to Goal 1 | 1)Purchase the licenses and program for Reading Street Common Core | June. 2016 – June 2017 | Director of Instructional Technology | N/A the district already has the required technology | Licenses and Program - $150K from school budget | RFP, Purchase Order and invoice | Director of Instructional technology and Ela supervisor oversee the planning of the installation process |
|  | 2) Curriculum Integration | July-August 2016 | ELA Supervisor | 3 ELA teachers | Curriculum work- 3 teachers at $57.00 per hour not to exceed 12 hours each | The curriculum learning objectives, activities, and evaluation | Software will be matched to learning standards and objectives to ensure success following the first software training. |
|  | 3) Implementation Monitoring and support | June 2016-June 2017 | Director of Instructional Technology and ELA Supervisor | N/A | N/A – budget cost allocated in the PD - Goal #4 | Informal assessment data based on curriculum meetings, PLC monthly reports, SGO’s, lesson plans, and student assessment data | Supervisors ensure that software is being used as indicated in the revised curriculum and that teachers are implementing the Reading street assessment to monitor student progress. |
|  | 4) Program Evaluation | Sept 2016 – June 2017 | Director of Instructional Technology and ELA Supervisor | N/A | N/A | Informal data collected through conversation and meetings, student assessment data 3 times per year, teacher feedback surveys and parent, student and teacher end of the year survey. | The information collected over the year is reviewed and analyzed and an end of the year survey will be implemented to determine success. |

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Action Plan** | | | | | | | |
| **School: Principal: Date Submitted**: | | | | | | | |
| Section A –Describe your goal, target audience, and identify which need(s) the goal addresses. (Refer to prior data analysis regarding needs) | | | | | | | |
| **Goal #2** | | By June 2017, reading interventions will be provided to support students who scored below 60 on the September administration of the Reading Street baseline assessment, and 80% of those students receiving literacy interventions will receive passing grades in reading (year-end average). | | | | | |
| **Target Audience** | | K-8 students identified as struggling readers | | | | | |
| **Identified Needs** | | Students need to meet CCSS in English Language Arts and achieve proficient on standardized assessments. | | | | | |
| **Outcomes/Objectives**  **Section B-**  **The outcomes must be measureable and directly aligned to Goal. This outcome/objective must be one of your technology related outcomes/objectives from Project #4 for this Goal** | **ACTION STEPS** – Section C – Descriptively list the action to ensure progress toward your goal. Action steps are strategies and interventions which should be research-based where possible and may *include professional development, technology, communication, and parent and community involvement initiatives within the action steps. (Use as many steps as you need for each Outcome)* | **IMPLEMENTATION INFORMATION** | | | | | |
| Section D– For each of the Action Steps you list, give timeline, person(s) responsible (for management, coordination and monitoring), required resources (infrastructure- services, physical and human resources),projected cost(s)/funding sources, evaluation data source with identified instrument/methodology, and principal strategies and responsibilities. (For Evaluation Strategy, define how you will evaluate the action step.) | | | | | |
| Timeline  (begin-end date for each step) | Person Responsible for coordination and reporting | Required Resources  (People, technology, furniture, etc.) | Estimated Projected Cost(s) & Funding Sources | Evaluation Data Source and Instruments used | Principal Strategies and Responsibilities to insure success |
| Action Step | Administer Reading Street baseline assessment to all students (K-8) at the outset of the school year. | Sept. 2016 | K-8 classroom teachers (general education, special education, and RTI)  Literacy/data committee  Principal | Classroom teachers (general education, special education, and RTI)  Reading Street Common Core program  Laptop computers | Reading Street Common Core site license and program  $75,000 from school budget | Baseline assessments | Completion of baseline assessment by all students in Grades K-8 |
| Action Step | Review baseline assessment results to identify those students scoring below 60 (Grades K-8). | Sept. 2016 | Literacy/data committee  Principal | Literacy/data committee  Principal | N/A | Baseline assessments | Evaluation of assessment results  Identification of students who score below 60 |
| Action Step | Identify staff to provide the following research-based interventions in reading:  Reading Street Common Core, Pathblazer, myON | Sept. 2016 | Principal  K-8 classroom teachers (general education, special education, RTI) | Principal  K-8 classroom teachers (general education, special education, RTI) | *Reading Street Common Core* site license  *Pathblazer* site license  *myON* site license  $75,000 from school budget | Teachers trained in use of programs | Ensure that teachers are trained in use of programs. Train or retrain as needed. |
| Action Step | Utilize data sources to match all struggling readers (students who score below 60 on baseline assessment) to a literacy intervention. | Sept. 2016 | Literacy/data committee members  Principal | Literacy/data committee members  Principal | N/A | Baseline assessment results  Literacy intervention descriptions  Student data (IEPs, progress reports) | Determine appropriateness of intervention for each student based on student’s individual needs and assessment results |
| Action Step | Monitor the progress of struggling readers and modify the interventions accordingly. | Sept. 2016 through June 2017 | K-8 classroom teachers (general education, special education, RTI)  Literacy/data committee members  Principal | K-8 classroom teachers (general education, special education, RTI)  Literacy/data committee members  Principal  Computers | N/A | Data tracking system for intervention programs | Utilize each program’s data tracking system  Meet bi-weekly to monitor progress  Modify interventions as needed (provide additional support, change programs) |
| Action Step | Administer year-end assessment | June 2017 | K-8 classroom teachers (general education, special education, RTI)  Literacy/data committee  Principal | Classroom teachers (general education, special education, and RTI)  Laptop computers  Intervention programs (Reading Street Common Core, Pathblazer, myON) | N/A | Year-end assessment | Completion of year-end assessment |

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Action Plan** | | | | | | | |
| **School: Principal: Date Submitted**: | | | | | | | |
| Section A –Describe your goal, target audience, and identify which need(s) the goal addresses. (Refer to prior data analysis regarding needs) | | | | | | | |
| **Goal #3** | | By June 2016, 50% of parents will have attended at least one Parent Night with a focus on literacy in order to increase parental involvement within the school community. | | | | | |
| **Target Audience** | | Parents/guardians of students in grades K-8 | | | | | |
| **Identified Needs** | | Involvement by parents contributes to students’ academic success. | | | | | |
| **Outcomes/Objectives**  **Section B-**  **The outcomes must be measureable and directly aligned to Goal. This outcome/objective must be one of your technology related outcomes/objectives from Project #4 for this Goal** | **ACTION STEPS** – Section C – Descriptively list the action to ensure progress toward your goal. Action steps are strategies and interventions which should be research-based where possible and may *include professional development, technology, communication, and parent and community involvement initiatives within the action steps.(Use as many steps as you need for each Outcome)* | **IMPLEMENTATION INFORMATION** | | | | | |
| Section D– For each of the Action Steps you list, give timeline, person(s) responsible (for management, coordination and monitoring), required resources (infrastructure- services, physical and human resources),projected cost(s)/funding sources, evaluation data source with identified instrument/methodology, and principal strategies and responsibilities. (For Evaluation Strategy, define how you will evaluate the action step.) | | | | | |
| Timeline  (begin-end date for each step) | Person Responsible for coordination and reporting – point person | Required Resources  (People, technology, furniture, etc.) | Estimated Projected Cost(s) and Funding Sources | Evaluation Data Source and Instruments used | Principal’s Strategies and Responsibilities to insure success for each step |
| Action Step | Establish a committee to plan and organize community based activities with an increased focused on parental involvement. | Sept. 2016 | Principal | Principal  Parental involvement committee | $2,000 from school budget | Schedule of activities that include parental involvement | Plan activities related to literacy |
| Action Step | Create digital messages for parents about how to be involved in the literacy success and academic achievement of their children. | Sept. 2016 through June 2017 | K-8 classroom teachers (general education, special education, RTI)  Parental involvement committee  Principal | K-8 classroom teachers (general education, special education, RTI)  Parental involvement committee  Principal | Digital cameras (8 @ $200)  $1,600 from school budget  Computers (already have)  Training for teachers N/A – budget cost allocated in the PD - Goal #4 | Links to digital messages | Ensure that teachers are trained in how to use equipment and how to create a digital message |

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Action Plan** | | | | | | | |
| **School: Principal: Date Submitted**: | | | | | | | |
| Section A –Describe your goal, target audience, and identify which need(s) the goal addresses. (Refer to prior data analysis regarding needs) | | | | | | | |
| **Goal #4** | | By June of 2017, 100% of the instructional staff will receive professional development in the area in which they specialize for the integration of technology into the reading and writing curriculum and will be participating on a professional learning community. | | | | | |
| **Target Audience** | | All district faculty and related staff – teachers, reading specialists, speech therapists, and media specialists | | | | | |
| **Identified Needs** | | Teachers are not integrating technology into their instruction in a meaningful thought provoking manner. In order implement include technology effectively in the English language arts curriculum a professional development program must be designed to include on-going learning activities, collaboration, connections to the curriculum, and resources (Fogle, 2014). | | | | | |
| **Outcomes/Objectives**  **Section B-**  **The outcomes must be measureable and directly aligned to Goal. This outcome/objective must be one of your technology related outcomes/objectives from Project #4 for this Goal** | **ACTION STEPS** – Section C – Descriptively list the action to ensure progress toward your goal. Action steps are strategies and interventions which should be research-based where possible and may *include professional development, technology, communication, and parent and community involvement initiatives within the action steps. (Use as many steps as you need for each Outcome)* | **IMPLEMENTATION INFORMATION** | | | | | |
| Section D– For each of the Action Steps you list, give timeline, person(s) responsible (for management, coordination and monitoring), required resources (infrastructure- services, physical and human resources),projected cost(s)/funding sources, evaluation data source with identified instrument/methodology, and principal strategies and responsibilities. (For Evaluation Strategy, define how you will evaluate the action step.) | | | | | |
| Timeline  (begin-end date for each step) | Person Responsible for coordination and reporting | Required Resources  (People, technology, furniture, etc.) | Estimated Projected Cost(s) & Funding Sources | Evaluation Data Source and Instruments used | Principal Strategies and Responsibilities to insure success |
| Outcome/Objective #1- IN THIS BOX – this outcome is only related to Goal 2, not Goal 1 | 1. Form a professional development committee to plan on-going training and support in curriculum integration of technology and use of the programs. The committee will create a Google Plus page for PD updates and information. | Begin – January 2016 – On-going | Director of Instructional Technology will chair the committee | Members will include a representative from each area of ELA instruction General Ed, Special Ed, and ELL | N/A | Minutes and action items of the committee. Survey data  End of the year survey | The committee will be made of stakeholders from each area of ElA instruction and implementation. Communication will be established through a Google plus page. Surveys will be reviewed prior to distribution by the technology coordinator. |
|  | 2) Send out a survey to determine staff knowledge and skills with technology and technology integration. | May 2016 | Director of Instructional  Technology and the PD Committee members | ProfilerPro online Survey tool | N/A – this is a free online tool | Survey responses | Administrators and supervisors announce the survey and its purposes to promote participation. Will use district group e-mail. |
|  | 3) Plan on-going professional development on the software programs to include the selection of a consultant, based upon district providers, to conduct training for teachers to learn the background of the software’s instructional design, receive a thorough understanding of operation of the software, and receive obtain instructional strategies to use when integrating the program technology. | June 2016  Sept. 2016  January 2017 | Director of Instructional Technology and the ELA curriculum supervisor | Media Center Computer Lab | Professional Development consultant fee $2,000 per day. For 3 days and 3 ELA areas = $12,000 | Workshop Questionnaire  End of the year survey | Three days have been planned to allow for teacher training of the software first and then the integration of the software.  Success will also be ensured through teacher feedback surveys. |
|  | 4) Instructional Technology department will provide training to teachers on the creation of videos and screencast application to enable them to design and create videos to inform parents. | September | Director of Instructional  Technology | District Computers, laptops, and Chromebooks and Screencast-o-matic screencast and editing online platform. | N/A due to already purchased district resources and free online platform | Workshop feedback, parental feedback, and end of the year survey. | To include parents in their children’s literacy learning teachers will develop videos to help parents understand how to support their child’s reading. Using the tools acquired in this workshop, teachers will develop instructional videos. |
|  | 5) On-going Professional Learning Communities – faculty begin meeting monthly in PLC groups and collaborating using Google applications on the integration process. | Sept. - June | Director of Instructional Technology and ELA Supervisor | Teachers will use district resources to research and Google aps to collaborate on the integration of technology programs into the ELA curriculum | N/A due to the fact that the district uses Google already | PLC monthly reports to their supervisors | Professional learning communities provide teachers with an opportunity for on-going PD to work through issues, share successes and plan lessons and units. |
|  | 6) Monitor and evaluate PD progress through voluntary meetings, workshop offerings, informal conversations, survey responses after consultant’s workshops, and an end of the year survey assessment. | Sept-June | Director of Instructional Technology | Media Center | N/A | Voluntary participation and feedback received from workshop surveys and end of the year surveys. | On-going monitoring will help to make the integration successful as issues can be resolved and successes can be shared and duplicated. |

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Action Plan-Writing Across the Grade Levels** | | | | | | | |
| **School: Principal: Date Submitted**: | | | | | | | |
| Section A –Describe your goal, target audience, and identify which need(s) the goal addresses. (Refer to prior data analysis regarding needs) | | | | | | | |
| **Goal #5** | | From October 2016 through June 2017, there will be a 25% increase in the number of students in Grades K-8 whose rubric score on the quarterly benchmark assessment writing section is a 3 or higher in order to measure growth in Common Core Writing mode traits and skills. | | | | | |
| **Target Audience** | | All students in K-8 (General Education, Special Education and English Language Learners) should be exposed to the increased rigors of the Common Core State Standards for their corresponding grade-level. | | | | | |
| **Identified Needs** | | Writing instruction should be personalized to meet individual student needs. Students should have opportunities for 1) regular practice with complex texts and academic language; 2) reading, writing and speaking grounded in evidence from the text, both literary and informational; 3) building knowledge through content-rich nonfiction | | | | | |
| **Outcomes/**  **Objectives**  **Section B-**  **The outcomes must be measureable and directly aligned to Goal. This outcome/objective must be one of your technology related outcomes/objectives from Project #4 for this Goal** | **ACTION STEPS** – Section C – Descriptively list the action to ensure progress toward your goal. Action steps are strategies and interventions which should be research-based where possible and may *include professional development, technology, communication, and parent and community involvement initiatives within the action steps.(Use as many steps as you need for each Outcome)* | **IMPLEMENTATION INFORMATION** | | | | | |
| Section D– For each of the Action Steps you list, give timeline, person(s) responsible (for management, coordination and monitoring), required resources (infrastructure- services, physical and human resources),projected cost(s)/funding sources, evaluation data source with identified instrument/methodology, and principal strategies and responsibilities. (For Evaluation Strategy, define how you will evaluate the action step.) | | | | | |
| Timeline  (begin-end date for each step) | Person Responsible for coordination and reporting – point person | Required Resources  (People, technology, furniture, etc.) | Estimated Projected Cost(s) and Funding Sources | Evaluation Data Source and Instruments used | Principal’s Strategies and Responsibilities to insure success for each step |
| Outcome/Objective #1- IN THIS BOX - this outcome is only related to Goal 1 | 1) Establish baseline writing scores using quarterly benchmark assessment writing prompts using Google Docs. | October 2016-  June 2017 | Technology Coordinator and Reading Specialist | Chromebooks, Laptops and Desktops  Google Docs | Additional resources do not need to be purchased.  Resources are readily available at this current time. | District Writing Rubric | School-wide quarterly reviews of benchmark assessments will be monitored by the data team and the school leadership during Professional Learning Communities (PLCs) |
|  | 2) Provide job-embedded professional development on the effective implementation of writer's workshop model. | Ongoing | Technology Coordinator and Reading Specialist | Edivate Software | $5,000 per school/per year | Danielson Teacher Evaluation Model  Product Invoices | Based on the results of the individual teacher’s evaluation using the Danielson Model, the school leadership will assign instructional videos to support teachers with the implementation of the writing process. The videos will be personalized to meet their specific needs. |
|  | 3) Purchase instructional supplies to support the effective implementation of the writer’s workshop, such as mentor texts, materials for publishing student work. | July 2016 | The Principal and Assistant Principal | Document Camera  Online Discussion Boards  Blogs    PowerPoint  Wikis  Mentor Texts  Explain Everything Software Licenses | Document Camera (Cost-$280.00) Lumens Ladibug DC125  myON Digital Library Licenses  ($2,000 per site)  Explain Everything Software Licenses  $2,400 ($3.00 per license/800 students) | Product Invoices | Teacher evaluations will determine if the resources are being adequately utilized. |
|  | 4) Recruit and select a school writing committee, including at least one representative per grade level to assist in analyzing student writing samples to further monitor progress and inform instruction. | October 2016-  June 2017 | Technology Coordinator | Writing Committee and Reading Specialist | 7 committee members (30 hours/$40.00 per hour)  Total: $8,400 | District Writing Rubric | The school leadership team will meet with the writing committee, the reading specialist and the district ELA supervisor to ensure that all students are meeting the grade level expectations in the area of writing. |
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