

Hazleton Area HS

School Level Plan

07/01/2012 - 06/30/2013

School Profile

Demographics

Hazleton Area HS

1601 W 23rd St
Hazleton, PA 18201-1646
(570) 459-3221

AYP Status: Corrective Action II (fifth year)
Title I Status: No

Principal Information

Rocco Petrone
petroner@hasdk12.org

Superintendent Information

Francis Antonelli
antonellif@hasdk12.org

Planning Committee

Name	Role
Rocco Petrone	Administrator
Anthony Conston	Administrator
Jeanne Conahan	Administrator
Ann Conflitti	Secondary School Teacher - Regular Education
Robert Barletta	Community Representative
Megan Taylor	Ed Specialist - School Counselor
Ryan Boris	Secondary School Teacher - Regular Education
Angela Moore	Secondary School Teacher - Regular Education
Lauren Maylath	Secondary School Teacher - Regular Education
Jason Turri	Secondary School Teacher - Regular Education
Mary Ann Molendini	Secondary School Teacher - Special Education
Jeffrey Attick	Secondary School Teacher - Regular Education
William Davenport	Secondary School Teacher - Regular Education
Dorothy Wood	Secondary School Teacher - Regular Education

Assurances

Non-Title I Schools

The school has verified the following Assurances:

Assurance 1: This School Improvement Plan contains Action Plans that address each reason why the school failed to make adequate yearly progress, or if the school has a status of Making Progress, this School Improvement Plan contains Action Plans that address Systemic Challenges the school has identified.

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

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

Needs Assessment

School Accomplishments

Accomplishment #1:

R2 •The “All Student Group” met performance targets with the help of the SH special provision.

Accomplishment #2:

R3 •From SY08-09 to SY09-10 the percentage went from 53.4% to 55.3%. From SY09-10 to SY10-11 the percentage went from 55.3% to 61.9%.

Accomplishment #3:

R7 •Grade 11 met or exceeded the standard for PA Academic Growth.

Accomplishment #4:

R9 •All predicted proficiency groups in all grades met or exceeded the standard for PA Academic Growth.

Accomplishment #5:

**R11 •All grades show a positive three year trend.
•In Grade 11, from SY08-09 to SY09-10 the percentage went from 53.4% to 55.2%. From SY09-10 to SY10-11 the percentage went from 55.2% to 61.9%.**

Accomplishment #6:

R12 •72.3% of the White subgroup was proficient or advanced.

Accomplishment #7:

R15•In SY08-09 to SY09-10 the percentage for the White subgroup went from 62.2% to 64.1%. From SY09-10 to SY10-11 the percentage went from 64.1% to 72.3%.

Accomplishment #8:

M9 •In grade 11, the Below Basic group met or exceeded the standard for PA Academic Growth.

Accomplishment #9:

M15 •In SY08-09 to SY09-10 the percentage for the White subgroup went from 50.1% to 51.6%. From SY09-10 to SY10-11 the percentage went from 51.6% to 53.1%.

School Concerns

Concern #1:

R1 •The “All Student Group” was below the target by 10.1%.

Concern #2:

R12 •Not every relevant subgroup met or exceeded the 72% target.

- 26.7% of the IEP subgroup was proficient or advanced.
- 6.2% of the ELL subgroup was proficient or advanced.
- 47.4% of the ED subgroup was proficient or advanced.
- 37.3% of the Latino subgroup was proficient or advanced.

Concern #3:

R13 •All relevant subgroups that did not meet the AYP target outright, made AYP with the help of a special provision.

- IEP subgroup with SH provision.
- ELL subgroup with SH provision.
- ED subgroup with SH provision.
- Latino subgroup with SH provision.

Concern #4:

R14 •The proficiency gap has increased between every relevant subgroup and the “All Student Group”.

Concern #5:

M1 •The “All Student Group” was below the target by 23.8%.

Concern #6:

M12 •No relevant subgroup met the 67% target.

- 11.5% of the IEP subgroup was proficient or advanced.
- 1.5% of the ELL subgroup was proficient or advanced.
- 28.9% of the ED subgroup was proficient or advanced.
- 20% of the Latino subgroup was proficient or advanced.
- 53.1% of the White subgroup was proficient or advanced.

Concern #7:

M14 •The proficiency gap has increased between every relevant subgroup and the “All Student Group”.

Concern #8:

•The graduation rate is 81.5%.

Prioritized Systemic Challenges

Systemic Challenge #1 (*System #7*) (High Schools Only—Graduation Rate) Establish a system within the school that fully ensures students who enter the school as 9th graders will complete the academic program and graduate in four years.

Aligned Concerns:

•The graduation rate is 81.5%.

Systemic Challenge #2 (*System #3*) Establish a system within the school that fully ensures school staff members use standards aligned assessments to monitor student achievement and adjust instructional practices.

Aligned Concerns:

R1 •The “All Student Group” was below the target by 10.1%.

R12 •Not every relevant subgroup met or exceeded the 72% target.

•26.7% of the IEP subgroup was proficient or advanced.

•6.2% of the ELL subgroup was proficient or advanced.

•47.4% of the ED subgroup was proficient or advanced.

•37.3% of the Latino subgroup was proficient or advanced.

R13 •All relevant subgroups that did not meet the AYP target outright, made AYP with the help of a special provision.

•IEP subgroup with SH provision.

•ELL subgroup with SH provision.

•ED subgroup with SH provision.

•Latino subgroup with SH provision.

R14 •The proficiency gap has increased between every relevant subgroup and the “All Student Group”.

M1 •The “All Student Group” was below the target by 23.8%.

M12 •No relevant subgroup met the 67% target.

- 11.5% of the IEP subgroup was proficient or advanced.
 - 1.5% of the ELL subgroup was proficient or advanced.
 - 28.9% of the ED subgroup was proficient or advanced.
 - 20% of the Latino subgroup was proficient or advanced.
 - 53.1% of the White subgroup was proficient or advanced.
-

M14 •The proficiency gap has increased between every relevant subgroup and the “All Student Group”.

Systemic Challenge #3 (*System #2*) Establish a system within the school that fully ensures the consistent implementation of effective instructional practices across all classrooms.

Aligned Concerns:

R1 •The “All Student Group” was below the target by 10.1%.

R12 •Not every relevant subgroup met or exceeded the 72% target.

- 26.7% of the IEP subgroup was proficient or advanced.
 - 6.2% of the ELL subgroup was proficient or advanced.
 - 47.4% of the ED subgroup was proficient or advanced.
 - 37.3% of the Latino subgroup was proficient or advanced.
-

R13 •All relevant subgroups that did not meet the AYP target outright, made AYP with the help of a special provision.

- IEP subgroup with SH provision.
 - ELL subgroup with SH provision.
 - ED subgroup with SH provision.
 - Latino subgroup with SH provision.
-

R14 •The proficiency gap has increased between every relevant subgroup and the “All Student Group”.

M1 •The “All Student Group” was below the target by 23.8%.

M12 •No relevant subgroup met the 67% target.

•11.5% of the IEP subgroup was proficient or advanced.

•1.5% of the ELL subgroup was proficient or advanced.

•28.9% of the ED subgroup was proficient or advanced.

•20% of the Latino subgroup was proficient or advanced.

•53.1% of the White subgroup was proficient or advanced.

M14 •The proficiency gap has increased between every relevant subgroup and the “All Student Group”.

Systemic Challenge #4 (*System #5*) Establish a system within the school that fully ensures school staff members monitor attendance and student participation in the learning process and respond with classroom and school-wide interventions when students are chronically absent or disengaged.

Aligned Concerns:

R1 •The “All Student Group” was below the target by 10.1%.

R12 •Not every relevant subgroup met or exceeded the 72% target.

•26.7% of the IEP subgroup was proficient or advanced.

•6.2% of the ELL subgroup was proficient or advanced.

•47.4% of the ED subgroup was proficient or advanced.

•37.3% of the Latino subgroup was proficient or advanced.

R13 •All relevant subgroups that did not meet the AYP target outright, made AYP with the help of a special provision.

•IEP subgroup with SH provision.

•ELL subgroup with SH provision.

•ED subgroup with SH provision.

•Latino subgroup with SH provision.

R14 •The proficiency gap has increased between every relevant subgroup and the “All Student Group”.

M1 •The “All Student Group” was below the target by 23.8%.

M12 •No relevant subgroup met the 67% target.

•11.5% of the IEP subgroup was proficient or advanced.

•1.5% of the ELL subgroup was proficient or advanced.

•28.9% of the ED subgroup was proficient or advanced.

•20% of the Latino subgroup was proficient or advanced.

•53.1% of the White subgroup was proficient or advanced.

M14 •The proficiency gap has increased between every relevant subgroup and the “All Student Group”.

Systemic Challenge #5 (*System #1*) Establish a system within the school that fully ensures consistent implementation of standards aligned curricula across all classrooms for all students.

Aligned Concerns:

R1 •The “All Student Group” was below the target by 10.1%.

R12 •Not every relevant subgroup met or exceeded the 72% target.

•26.7% of the IEP subgroup was proficient or advanced.

•6.2% of the ELL subgroup was proficient or advanced.

•47.4% of the ED subgroup was proficient or advanced.

•37.3% of the Latino subgroup was proficient or advanced.

R13 •All relevant subgroups that did not meet the AYP target outright, made AYP with the help of a special provision.

•IEP subgroup with SH provision.

•ELL subgroup with SH provision.

•ED subgroup with SH provision.

•Latino subgroup with SH provision.

R14 •The proficiency gap has increased between every relevant subgroup and the “All Student Group”.

M1 •The “All Student Group” was below the target by 23.8%.

M12 •No relevant subgroup met the 67% target.

- 11.5% of the IEP subgroup was proficient or advanced.
 - 1.5% of the ELL subgroup was proficient or advanced.
 - 28.9% of the ED subgroup was proficient or advanced.
 - 20% of the Latino subgroup was proficient or advanced.
 - 53.1% of the White subgroup was proficient or advanced.
-

M14 •The proficiency gap has increased between every relevant subgroup and the “All Student Group”.

Systemic Challenge #6 (*System #4*) Establish a system within the school that fully ensures students who are academically at risk are identified early and are supported by a process that provides interventions based upon student needs and includes procedures for monitoring effectiveness.

Aligned Concerns:

R1 •The “All Student Group” was below the target by 10.1%.

R12 •Not every relevant subgroup met or exceeded the 72% target.

- 26.7% of the IEP subgroup was proficient or advanced.
 - 6.2% of the ELL subgroup was proficient or advanced.
 - 47.4% of the ED subgroup was proficient or advanced.
 - 37.3% of the Latino subgroup was proficient or advanced.
-

R13 •All relevant subgroups that did not meet the AYP target outright, made AYP with the help of a special provision.

- IEP subgroup with SH provision.
 - ELL subgroup with SH provision.
 - ED subgroup with SH provision.
 - Latino subgroup with SH provision.
-

R14 •The proficiency gap has increased between every relevant subgroup and the “All Student Group”.

M1 •The “All Student Group” was below the target by 23.8%.

M12 •No relevant subgroup met the 67% target.

•11.5% of the IEP subgroup was proficient or advanced.

•1.5% of the ELL subgroup was proficient or advanced.

•28.9% of the ED subgroup was proficient or advanced.

•20% of the Latino subgroup was proficient or advanced.

•53.1% of the White subgroup was proficient or advanced.

M14 •The proficiency gap has increased between every relevant subgroup and the “All Student Group”.

Systemic Challenge #7 (System #8) Establish a system within the school that fully ensures professional development is focused, strategic and implemented with fidelity.

Systemic Challenge #8 (System #9) Establish a system within the school that fully ensures teachers and administrators meet on a regular basis to use multiple data sources to reflect on the progress of student learning as it relates to the effectiveness of professional practice.

Systemic Challenge #9 (System #10) Establish a system within the school that fully ensures teachers and administrators receive timely, effective support and intervention as needed.

Systemic Challenge #10 (System #11) Establish a system within the school that fully ensures classrooms are staffed with highly qualified teachers and that student needs drive decisions about teacher placement.

Systemic Challenge #11 (System #12) Establish a system within the school that fully ensures the school's resources effectively address instructional priorities that are aligned with the school's vision and mission.

Systemic Challenge #12 (System #13) Establish a system within the school that fully ensures each member of the school community promotes, enhances and sustains a shared vision of positive school climate.

Systemic Challenge #13 (System #14) Establish a system within the school that fully ensures the school has partnered with families and the community to support student participation in the learning process.

School Level Plan

Action Plans

Goal #1: (High Schools Only—Graduation Rate) Establish a system within the school that fully ensures students who enter the school as 9th graders will complete the academic program and graduate in four years.

Indicators of Effectiveness:

Type: Summative

Data Source: Graduation rate will improve June 5, 2013

Specific Targets: Increase graduation rate to 85%

Type: Summative

Data Source: Course Failures January 18, 2013 & June 5, 2013

Specific Targets: 10% decrease failures

Type: Formative

Data Source: Absent Rates and Tardies 2012-2013 and 2013-2014

Specific Targets: 10% decrease absenteeism and tardies

Type: Formative

Data Source: Discipline Records 2012-2013 and 2013-2014

Specific Targets: 10% decrease incidents and referrals

Type: Formative

Data Source: TeachScape Data August 31, 2012-June 5, 2013

Specific Targets: 10% increase in student engagement

Strategies:

Behavior Program

Description:

Behavior Program will monitor disruptive, non-compliant, and at-risk students by use of portfolio maintenance and classroom teacher documentation. This will help achieve student success in the classroom as well as increase graduation rates.

SAS Alignment: Standards, Assessment, Curriculum Framework, Instruction, Materials & Resources, Safe and Supportive Schools

Diverse Student Committee

Description:

Create a diverse student committee to address concerns with administration from the student body as to why students' graduation rate is declining.

SAS Alignment: Instruction, Safe and Supportive Schools

Faculty Mentoring Program

Description:

Implement a Faculty Mentoring Program during the school day to provide students with academic monitoring and educational programs in a small group setting in order to focus on overall student improvement to increase graduation rates.

SAS Alignment: Standards, Assessment, Curriculum Framework, Instruction, Materials & Resources, Safe and Supportive Schools

Action Steps:

Provide professional development on working with difficult students utilizing the book When Teaching Gets Tough.

Indicator of Implementation:

Sign-in sheets, agendas, documentation of discussion that has taken place

Start Date: 9/4/2012 **End Date:** 1/18/2013

Program Area(s): Professional Education, Teacher Induction

Supported Strategies:

- *Behavior Program*

Develop a protocol for teachers to follow for disruptive, non-compliant, and at-risk students who are chronically absent or disengaged.

Indicator of Implementation:

Guidelines on how to handle disruptive, non-compliant, and at-risk students who are chronically absent or disengaged

Start Date: 8/27/2012 **End Date:** 12/21/2012

Program Area(s): Professional Education

Supported Strategies:

- *Behavior Program*

Teachers will document interventions they have used with disruptive, non-compliant, and at-risk students who are chronically absent or disengaged.

Indicator of Implementation:

Documentation of teacher interventions

Start Date: 1/2/2013 **End Date:** 6/5/2013

Program Area(s): Student Services

Supported Strategies:

- *Behavior Program*

Teachers will create formative/summative Assessment Portfolio for each student in each class by using CDT and curriculum assessments.

Indicator of Implementation:

Folder for each student

Start Date: 8/30/2012 **End Date:** 6/5/2013

Program Area(s): Student Services

Supported Strategies:

- *Behavior Program*

Principals and Vice-Principals will create a rubric for assessing student engagement using TeachScape.

Indicator of Implementation:

TeachScape rubric

Start Date: 8/27/2012 **End Date:** 12/21/2012

Program Area(s): Professional Education

Supported Strategies:

- *Behavior Program*

Principals and Vice-Principals will train teachers on how rubric will be used to assess student engagement using TeachScape.

Indicator of Implementation:

Sign-in sheets, agendas, TeachScape rubric

Start Date: 1/22/2013 **End Date:** 1/22/2013

Program Area(s): Professional Education

Supported Strategies:

- *Behavior Program*

Principals and Vice-Principals will utilize rubric to assess student engagement using TeachScape during Walk-through observations.

Indicator of Implementation:

TeachScape data

Start Date: 1/23/2013 **End Date:** 6/5/2013

Program Area(s): Professional Education

Supported Strategies:

- *Behavior Program*

Select volunteers to be members of the student committee to address school concerns.

Indicator of Implementation:

Roster of selected student committee members

Start Date: 8/30/2012 **End Date:** 10/31/2012

Program Area(s): Student Services

Supported Strategies:

- *Diverse Student Committee*

Student focus groups will meet monthly with administration to discuss various topics and concerns.

Indicator of Implementation:

Meeting agendas and minutes

Start Date: 11/1/2012 **End Date:** 6/5/2013

Program Area(s): Student Services

Supported Strategies:

- *Diverse Student Committee*

Create a bell schedule during the school day to be utilized for a Faculty Mentoring Program.

Indicator of Implementation:

A schedule will be distributed and posted to all faculty and staff during in-service days

Start Date: 7/1/2012 **End Date:** 8/24/2012

Program Area(s): Professional Education

Supported Strategies:

- *Faculty Mentoring Program*

Create alphabetical homeroom lists of 25 students by grade level utilizing all faculty except guidance.

Indicator of Implementation:

Rosters of alphabetical homeroom lists

Start Date: 8/27/2012 **End Date:** 9/21/2012

Program Area(s): Student Services

Supported Strategies:

- *Faculty Mentoring Program*

Utilize Principal's webpage to monitor faculty progress of completing tasks during Faculty Mentoring Program.

Indicator of Implementation:

Webpage

Start Date: 9/24/2012 **End Date:** 6/5/2013

Program Area(s): Professional Education

Supported Strategies:

- *Faculty Mentoring Program*

Implement professional development on duties of the participants of the Faculty Mentoring Program.

Indicator of Implementation:

Rosters, sign-in sheets, agenda, webpage review, Act 80 day agenda, department meeting agendas

Start Date: 9/28/2012 **End Date:** 10/12/2012

Program Area(s): Professional Education

Supported Strategies:

- *Faculty Mentoring Program*

Develop monthly calendar of Faculty Mentoring Program meetings.

Indicator of Implementation:

Calendar of monthly events

Start Date: 10/15/2012 **End Date:** 10/21/2012

Program Area(s): Professional Education

Supported Strategies:

- *Faculty Mentoring Program*

Re-evaluate the Faculty Mentoring Program with pros, cons, revisions, suggestions, etc.

Indicator of Implementation:

Sign-in sheets, documentation of suggestions

Start Date: 6/5/2013 **End Date:** 6/5/2013

Program Area(s): Professional Education

Supported Strategies:

- *Faculty Mentoring Program*

Goal #2: Establish a system within the school that fully ensures school staff members use standards aligned assessments to monitor student achievement and adjust instructional practices.

Indicators of Effectiveness:

Type: Summative

Data Source: Classroom Diagnostic Tools (CDT) Semester 2-January 31, 2013, April 5, 2013, May 31, 2013

Specific Targets: Students in Algebra Concepts, Algebra 1, and English II, will take the CDT.

10% increase in overall scores from 1st to 3rd benchmark

Type: Summative

Data Source: ACCESS (Assessing Comprehension and Communication in English State-to-State for English Language Learners)
(May 31, 2012-May 31, 2013)

Specific Targets: Grades 9-12

10% increase of ELL student population scoring above 5.0 between academic school years

Type: Summative

Data Source: AIMSweb (May 31, 2012-May 31, 2013)

Specific Targets: 10% increase of Special Education student population in reading grade level benchmarks

Type: Summative

Data Source: Scholastic Reading Inventory (May 31, 2012-May 31, 2013)

Specific Targets: 10% increase of Special Education student population in reading lexile scores

Type: Summative

Data Source: Lower Course Failures January 18, 2013 & June 5, 2013

Specific Targets: Decrease course failure rates by 10% overall

Type: Summative

Data Source: keystones Exams January 18, 2013 June 5, 2013, January 18, 2014, & June 5, 2014

Specific Targets: All students will show one year's growth from 2012-2013 and 2013-2014

Strategies:

Common Assessment

Description:

Common Assessment within Grade/Subject, the Classroom Diagnostic (CDT), would provide a universal screening tool to identify all students who are academically at risk as well those achieving at grade level in math and reading.

SAS Alignment: Assessment, Standards, Curriculum Framework, Instruction, Materials & Resources

Data Informed Instruction

Description:

Data informed instruction will be utilized to acquire more effective school-based resources to help address the individual needs of the at-risk learner.

SAS Alignment: Instruction, Standards, Assessment, Curriculum Framework, Materials & Resources

Classroom Diagnostic Tool (CDT)

Description:

All students will be given the CDT upon entering the follow courses: Algebra Concepts, Algebra 1; and English II. All new students without transcripts will be given the CDT upon arrival to the district to measure ability. Then, differentiation of instruction for multi-strategic instructional practices will be implemented in every classroom along with progress monitoring data to guide instruction.

SAS Alignment: Instruction, Standards, Assessment, Curriculum Framework, Materials & Resources

Action Steps:

Technology and administration need to receive Professional Development Training on the CDT implementation.

Indicator of Implementation:

Agenda, sign-in sheets, training dates established for training teachers

Start Date: 7/5/2012 **End Date:** 9/28/2012

Program Area(s): Professional Education, Educational Technology

Supported Strategies:

- *Classroom Diagnostic Tool (CDT)*

Teachers need to receive Professional Development Training on the CDT implementation in specific courses including Algebra Concepts, Algebra 1, and English II.

Indicator of Implementation:

The proper way to administer CDT will be presented through data teams during in-service and staff development. Agenda, sign-in sheets, teacher utilization of the program

Start Date: 10/1/2012 **End Date:** 12/3/2012

Program Area(s): Professional Education, Educational Technology

Supported Strategies:

- *Classroom Diagnostic Tool (CDT)*

Administer CDT in specific courses including Algebra Concepts, Algebra 1, and English II.

Indicator of Implementation:

This test will specifically be given three times per semester. The course level documentation and analysis of results will be assessed after each test.

Start Date: 1/23/2013 **End Date:** 5/31/2013

Program Area(s): Student Services, Educational Technology

Supported Strategies:

- *Classroom Diagnostic Tool (CDT)*

Teachers need to receive Professional Development Training on the CDT data analysis and differentiation of instruction based on the need levels of students.

Indicator of Implementation:

Agenda, sign-in sheets, teacher utilization of the program

Start Date: 1/30/2013 **End Date:** 6/7/2013

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

Supported Strategies:

- *Classroom Diagnostic Tool (CDT)*

Analyze the Data from each CDT test.

Indicator of Implementation:

Documentation of results of each student

Start Date: 1/30/2013 **End Date:** 6/7/2013

Program Area(s): Professional Education

Supported Strategies:

- *Classroom Diagnostic Tool (CDT)*

Determine the type and amount of instruction/intervention a student needs through the use of student data.

Indicator of Implementation:

Principals and Vice-Principals will monitor teacher's interventions, progress monitoring, data analysis, implementation of differentiated instruction in the classroom, lesson plans, teacher evaluations, and TeachScape

Start Date: 1/30/2013 **End Date:** 6/7/2013

Program Area(s): Student Services

Supported Strategies:

- *Data Informed Instruction*

Progress Monitoring.

Indicator of Implementation:

The readjustment of groups to differentiate instruction and second administration of the CDT

Start Date: 1/30/2013 **End Date:** 6/7/2013

Program Area(s): Professional Education, Student Services

Supported Strategies:

- *Data Informed Instruction*

Goal #3: Establish a system within the school that fully ensures the consistent implementation of effective instructional practices across all classrooms.

Indicators of Effectiveness:

Type: Summative

Data Source: JAC Testing-Please Revise

Specific Targets: JAC Testing-Please Revise

Strategies:

Professional Development-Research Based Strategies

Description:

Design and implement professional development to train teachers on effective research based strategies to increase student achievement through the use of professional learning communities.

SAS Alignment: Instruction, Standards, Assessment, Curriculum Framework, Materials & Resources

Research Based Strategies

Description:

Design and implement utilization of 30 minutes of staff development to incorporate research based strategies in all classrooms thus differentiated instruction that reflects challenging learning expectations for all students.

SAS Alignment: Instruction, Standards, Assessment, Curriculum Framework, Materials & Resources

Differentiated Instruction

Description:

Differentiated instruction will reflect tiered lessons to increase student achievement among all students in all classrooms.

SAS Alignment: Instruction, Standards, Assessment, Curriculum Framework, Materials & Resources

Accountability

Description:

The administrative team will hold all staff members accountable for consistent implementation of effective instructional practices.

SAS Alignment: Instruction, Standards, Assessment, Curriculum Framework, Materials & Resources

Action Steps:

Staff Development will address research based instruction and will inform teachers on planning and delivery of instruction

Indicator of Implementation:

Agendas and Act 48 Evaluations

Start Date: 10/1/2012 **End Date:** 6/5/2014

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

Supported Strategies:

- *Professional Development-Research Based Strategies*
- *Research Based Strategies*
- *Differentiated Instruction*

Create co-curricular professional learning communities.

Indicator of Implementation:

Rosters created for professional learning communities

Start Date: 11/1/2012 **End Date:** 12/21/2012

Program Area(s): Professional Education

Supported Strategies:

- *Professional Development-Research Based Strategies*
- *Research Based Strategies*

Thirty minutes of morning staff development time will be utilized twice a week in order to discuss, design, and implement roles and responsibilities for members for each group.

Indicator of Implementation:

Agenda, sign-in sheet submitted at conclusion of each meeting, department chairperson will facilitate professional development for teachers to explain what needs to be accomplished throughout the school year, schedule monthly teacher rotation for sharing instructional practices

Start Date: 1/7/2013 **End Date:** 2/8/2013

Program Area(s): Professional Education

Supported Strategies:

- *Professional Development-Research Based Strategies*

Conduct weekly Instructional Conversations with specific groups that were established.

Indicator of Implementation:

Sign-in sheets, agendas, lesson plans, student work, review blogging

Start Date: 2/11/2013 **End Date:** 6/5/2013

Program Area(s): Professional Education

Supported Strategies:

- *Professional Development-Research Based Strategies*
- *Research Based Strategies*
- *Differentiated Instruction*
- *Accountability*

Re-evaluate and re-organize instructional conversations and reciprocal teaching with pros, cons, revisions, suggestions, etc.

Indicator of Implementation:

Sign-in sheets, student work, online documentation

Start Date: 6/3/2013 **End Date:** 6/7/2013

Program Area(s): Professional Education

Supported Strategies:

- *Professional Development-Research Based Strategies*
- *Accountability*

Create a blogging system within the network which will allow instructional conversations to take place in an electronic format fostering teacher interactions regardless of building placement, planning period, and teacher schedule.

Indicator of Implementation:

Blogging information pages available for all teachers.

Start Date: 8/27/2012 **End Date:** 1/18/2013

Program Area(s): Professional Education

Supported Strategies:

- *Accountability*

Professional development for teachers how to use the blogging systems.

Indicator of Implementation:

Sign-in sheets, guidelines of how and when to blog

Start Date: 1/22/2013 **End Date:** 2/1/2013

Program Area(s): Professional Education

Supported Strategies:

- *Professional Development-Research Based Strategies*
- *Accountability*

Implementing blogging among the three buildings on the high school campus in order for conversations can extend to the entire faculty and staff.

Indicator of Implementation:

Teacher blogging

Start Date: 2/11/2013 **End Date:** 3/1/2013

Program Area(s): Professional Education

Supported Strategies:

- *Professional Development-Research Based Strategies*
- *Research Based Strategies*

- *Accountability*

Principals and Vice-Principals will establish a protocol to ensure implementation of professional learning communities and blogging system.

Indicator of Implementation:

Established protocol

Start Date: 8/27/2012 **End Date:** 6/7/2013

Program Area(s): Professional Education

Supported Strategies:

- *Professional Development-Research Based Strategies*

Principals and Vice-Principals will monitor professional learning communities and blogging system.

Indicator of Implementation:

Administrative weekly walk through observations of classroom and professional learning communities, and online documentation of blog.

Start Date: 8/27/2012 **End Date:** 6/7/2013

Program Area(s): Professional Education

Supported Strategies:

- *Professional Development-Research Based Strategies*
- *Accountability*

Achievement Targets

Sub-Group	Reading/Literature		Math	
Students Overall	61.9%	72.0%	43.2%	53.0%
White non-Hispanic	72.3%	82.0%	53.1%	63.0%
IEP-Special Education	26.7%	37.0%	11.5%	22.0%
Economically Disadvantaged	47.4%	57.0%	28.9%	39.0%
Latino/Hispanic	37.3%	47.0%	20.0%	30.0%
English Language Learners	6.2%	16.0%	1.5%	12.0%
Sub-groups listed below are optional.				

Performance Targets

Test Participation for PSSA Reading and Math

2012 target for the minimum percentage of students participating in PSSA–Reading: 95.0%

2012 target for the minimum percentage of students participating in PSSA–Math: 95.0%

Attendance (K-8 Only)

2012 attendance rate target for the school: Not provided

Graduation (High Schools Only)

2012 graduation rate target for the school: 85.0%

Assurance of Quality and Accountability

We, the undersigned, hereby certify that the school level plan for Hazleton Area HS in the Hazleton Area SD has been duly reviewed by the Superintendent of Schools and formally approved by the district's Board of Education, per guidelines required by the Pennsylvania Department of Education.

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

- Addresses all the **required components** prescribed by the Pennsylvania Department of Education
- Reflects **sound educational practice**
- Has a **high probability of improving student achievement**
- Has sufficient **District leadership and support to ensure successful implementation**

With this *Assurance of Quality & Accountability*, we, therefore, request that the Secretary of Education and the Pennsylvania Department of Education grant formal approval to implement the school level plan submitted by Hazleton Area HS in the Hazleton Area SD for the 2012-2013 school-year.

Affirmed by Francis Antonelli on 8/29/2012

Superintendent of Schools

Affirmed by Brian Earley on 8/29/2012

School Board President