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LGMS current School Improvement Plan (SIP) will soon be outdated because of Durham school district’s two-year shelf life for these plans. It is a requirement for the plan to be constantly updated after each official School Improvement Team meetings (which most schools conduct monthly). As of this date, there are several sections, provisions and membership which need to be updated. If there were updates made immediately after the next SIT meeting (Sept.), then the remaining shelf-life of the current SIP would be only sixty days (expiration date of Nov. 16th, 2017).

The current SIP was created and maintained on an online system which is no longer used by Durham Public Schools (DPS). The next generation of Lowe’s Grove SIP will be created by a system called NC Star, a system believed to be more user friendly with this plan than under the previous system.

MISSION STATEMENTS: LGMS’s mission doesn’t completely align with DPS mission. The district mission doesn’t connect student success to EOG scores, but LGMS mission does. Improper vertical alignment.

School SMART GOALS: for this heading, I compared the percentage goals stated in the SIP to data found in the Teacher’s Working Survey and EOG data available to the public. Under the Smart Goal heading, LGMS quoted DPS foci instead of putting their own foci to the forefront. LGMS goal of exceeding growth (under student achievement) was not realized. The overall percentage goals which were developed from Teacher’s Working Conditions Survey (TWCS) data was not realized over a two-year span. In fact, the TWCS heading of *Teacher Sentiment toward School Leadership* actually dropped percentage points.

There are instances where common education jargon is used, but the writing lacked specificity in how the strategy would be carried out, the specific role of each stakeholder, and how funds would be purposefully distributed and utilized. For instance, Strategy #3 is to, *Utilize data to drive instruction,* which is an often-used phrase, but there was not enough evidence within the SIP to show exactly what this phrase would look like in implementation. This style of document input is found in a large percentage of the SIP. As another example, you find such phraseology as: 1) *We are establishing systems & planning strategies which implement change* or, 2) *Create a positive climate for teachers by giving specific, positive reinforcement.* Jargon like this seems (to me) overly complicated, and leads me to wonder if the jargon was used just for the sake of fulfilling a district directive without actually being invested in the tenets of the document itself.