



Pam Stewart, Commissioner

2013-2014 SCHOOL IMPROVEMENT PLAN

Auburndale Central Elementary School

320 LEMON ST

Auburndale, FL 33823

863-965-5450

<http://schools.polk-fl.net/ace/>

School Demographics

School Type Elementary School	Title I Yes	Free and Reduced Lunch Rate 69%
Alternative/ESE Center No	Charter School No	Minority Rate 55%

School Grades History

2013-14 D	2012-13 C	2011-12 D	2010-11 C	2009-10 C
---------------------	---------------------	---------------------	---------------------	---------------------

SIP Authority and Template

Section 1001.42(18), Florida Statutes (F.S.), requires district school boards to annually approve and require implementation of a school improvement plan (SIP) for each school in the district.

The Florida Department of Education (FDOE) SIP template meets all statutory and rule requirements for traditional public schools and incorporates all components required for schools receiving Title I funds, as marked by citations to the No Child Left Behind (NCLB) Act of 2001. This template is required by State Board of Education Rule 6A-1.099811, Florida Administrative Code (F.A.C.), for all non-charter schools with a current grade of D or F, or with a grade of F within the prior two years. For all other schools, the district may use a template of its choosing. All districts must submit annual assurances that their plans meet statutory requirements.

This document was prepared by school and district leadership using the FDOE's school improvement planning web application located at <https://www.floridacims.org>. Sections marked "N/A" by the user and any performance data representing fewer than 10 students or educators have been excluded from this document.

Table of Contents

Purpose and Outline of the SIP	4
Differentiated Accountability	5
Part I: Current School Status	6
Part II: Expected Improvements	17
Goals Summary	21
Goals Detail	21
Action Plan for Improvement	26
Part III: Coordination and Integration	38
Appendix 1: Professional Development Plan to Support Goals	39
Appendix 2: Budget to Support Goals	44

Purpose and Outline of the SIP

The SIP is intended to be the primary artifact used by every school with stakeholders to review data, set goals, create an action plan and monitor progress. A corollary at the district level is the District Improvement and Assistance Plan (DIAP), designed to help district leadership make the necessary connections between school and district goals in order to align resources. The Florida Department of Education encourages schools to use the SIP as a “living document” by continually updating, refining and using the plan to guide their work throughout the year. This printed version represents the SIP as of the “Date Modified” listed in the footer.

Part I: Current School Status

Part I summarizes school leadership, staff qualifications and strategies for recruiting, mentoring and retaining strong teachers. The school’s Multi-Tiered System of Supports (MTSS) is described in detail to show how data is used by stakeholders to understand the needs of all students and allocate appropriate resources in proportion to those needs. The school also summarizes its efforts in a few specific areas, such as its use of increased learning time and strategies to support literacy, preschool transition and college and career readiness.

Part II: Expected Improvements

Part II outlines school performance data in the prior year and sets numeric targets for the coming year in ten areas:

1. Reading
2. Writing
3. Mathematics
4. Science
5. Science, Technology, Engineering and Mathematics (STEM)
6. Career and Technical Education (CTE)
7. Social Studies
8. Early Warning Systems (EWS)
9. Parental Involvement
10. Other areas of concern to the school

With this overview of the current state of the school in mind and the outcomes they hope to achieve, the planning team engages in an 8-Step Planning and Problem-Solving Process, through which they define and refine their goals (Step 1), identify and prioritize problems (barriers) keeping them from reaching those goals (Steps 2-3), design a plan to help them implement strategies to resolve those barriers (Steps 4-7), and determine how they will monitor progress toward each goal (Step 8).

Part III: Coordination and Integration

Part III is required for Title I schools and describes how federal, state and local funds are coordinated and integrated to ensure student needs are met.

Appendix 1: Professional Development Plan to Support Goals

Appendix 1 is the professional development plan, which outlines any training or support needed for stakeholders to meet the goals.

Appendix 2: Budget to Support Goals

Appendix 2 is the budget needed to implement the strategies identified in the plan.

Differentiated Accountability

Florida's Differentiated Accountability (DA) system is a statewide network of strategic support, differentiated by need according to performance data, and provided to schools and districts in order to improve leadership capacity, teacher efficacy and student outcomes. DA field teams collaborate with district and school leadership to design, implement and refine school improvement plans, as well as provide instructional coaching, as needed.

DA Regions

Florida's DA network is divided into five geographical regions, each served by a field team led by a regional executive director (RED).

DA Categories

Traditional public schools are classified at the start of each school year, based upon the most recently released school grades (A-F), into one of the following categories:

- Not in DA – currently A or B with no F in prior two years; all charter schools; all ungraded schools
- Monitoring Only – currently A or B with at least one F in the prior two years
- Prevent – currently C
- Focus – currently D
 - Year 1 – declined to D, or first-time graded schools receiving a D
 - Year 2 – second consecutive D, or F followed by a D
 - Year 3 or more – third or more consecutive D, or F followed by second consecutive D
- Priority – currently F
 - Year 1 – declined to F, or first-time graded schools receiving an F
 - Year 2 or more – second or more consecutive F

DA Turnaround and Monitoring Statuses

Additionally, schools in DA are subject to one or more of the following Turnaround and Monitoring Statuses:

- Former F – currently A-D with at least one F in the prior two years. SIP is monitored by FDOE.
- Post-Priority Planning – currently A-D with an F in the prior year. District is planning for possible turnaround.
- Planning – Focus Year 2 and Priority Year 1. District is planning for possible turnaround.
- Implementing – Focus Year 3 or more and Priority Year 2 or more. District is implementing the Turnaround Option Plan (TOP).

2013-14 DA Category and Statuses

DA Category	Region	RED
Focus Year 1	3	Ella Thompson

Former F	Post-Priority Planning	Planning	Implementing TOP
No	No	No	No

Current School Status

School Information

School-Level Information

School

Auburndale Central Elementary

Principal

Badonna Dardis

School Advisory Council chair

Mr. Gary Henson

Names and position titles of the School-Based Leadership Team (SBLT)

Name	Title
Badonna Dardis	Principal
Monica Grice	Assistant Principal
Dawn Seefeldt	School Psychologist
Tonetta Morris-Freeman	ESE Teacher
Laura Edmonds	Network Manager
Barbara Riley	Guidance Counselor
Shelley Reinacher	Resource Teacher/Teacher Trainer

District-Level Information

District

Polk

Superintendent

Dr. Kathryn Leroy

Date of school board approval of SIP

1/29/2014

School Advisory Council (SAC)

This section meets the requirements of Section 1114(b)(1), P.L. 107-110, NCLB, codified at 20 U.S.C. § 6314(b).

Membership of the SAC

Membership - 46.97% white, 19.55% Black, .45% Asian, .22% Indian, .22% Pacific Island, 2.92 multi-racial, and 29.66% Hispanic. We have 58.33% community members and 41.67% school members. Principal: Badonna Dardis, Assistant Principal - Monica Grice, SAC Chair - Gary Henson, Teachers - Oscar Loya, Janet Aguilar, Tonetta Morris-Freeman, Madison Paye, Miranda Hall, Sheryl Henry, and Windy Snyder, Community - Judy Lott, Lasonya Hodges, Elizabeth Padila, Tammy Sullivan, Yvonne Moshier, Heather Garcia, Terrie Zanella, Suhong Wang, Josephine Martinez, Reynel Valasquez, Peggy Shadrack and Isabel Escobedo.

Involvement of the SAC in the development of the SIP

SAC chair assisted with the foundational piece of the school improvement plan (SIP). The SAC made recommendations and approved the SIP.

Activities of the SAC for the upcoming school year

The School Advisory Council assist in the preparation, implementation, and evaluation of the School Improvement Plan. The Council makes recommendations and assists the school administration in all areas of school improvement. These functions are performed through participatory decision-making by parents, educators, school staff, business people, and other community members who are stakeholders in the school.

Projected use of school improvement funds, including the amount allocated to each project

Currently we do not have any funds allocated for projects.

Compliance with section 1001.452, F.S., regarding the establishment duties of the SAC

In Compliance

If not in compliance, describe the measures being taken to comply with SAC requirements

Highly Qualified Staff

This section meets the requirements of Sections 1114(b)(1)(C) and 1115(c)(1)(E), P.L. 107-110, NCLB, codified at 20 U.S.C. § 6314(b).

Administrators

of administrators

2

receiving effective rating or higher

(not entered because basis is < 10)

Administrator Information:

Badonna Dardis

Principal

Years as Administrator: 9

Years at Current School: 4

Credentials

Master’s Educational Leadership,
Principal Certification K-12
BA in Varying Exceptionalities/Gifted

Performance Record

2012-2013: School Grade C, 43% of students scoring at or above grade level in reading, 47% of students scoring at or above level in math. 41% scoring at or above level in science, 61% are meeting state standards of a 3.5 in writing, 71% making learning gains in reading, 54% making learning gains in math, 80% of the lowest 25% making learning gains in reading, and 42% of the lowest 25% making learning gains in math.

2011-2012: School Grade D, 31% of students scoring at or above grade level in reading, 36% of students scoring at or above grade level in math, 26% scoring at or above grade level in science, 54% are meeting state standards in writing, 54% making learning gains in reading, 49% making learning gains in math, 73% of the lowest 25% making learning gains in reading, 70% of the lowest 25% making learning gains in math.

2010 – 2011: School Grade C, 43% of students scoring at or above grade level in reading, 53% of students scoring at or above grade level in math, 33% scoring at or above grade level in science, 87% are meeting state standards in writing, 55% making learning gains in reading, 57% making learning gains in math, 60% of the lowest 25% making learning gains in reading , 53% of the lowest 25% making learning gains in math, and 79% of AYP criteria met.

2009-2010: School Grade C, 47% of students scoring at or above grade level in reading, 60% of students scoring at or above grade level in math, 29% scoring at or above grade level in science, 63% are meeting state standards in writing, 62% making learning gains in reading, 72% making learning gains in math, 67% of the lowest 25% making learning gains in reading , 70% of the lowest 25% making learning gains in math, and 82% of AYP criteria met.

Monica Grice

Asst Principal

Years as Administrator: 7

Years at Current School: 1

Credentials

BA-University of TN, Special, Early Childhood, and Elementary Education;
 MS-Nova Southeastern, Educational Leadership

Performance Record

Assistant Principal of Rochelle School of the Arts from 2006- 2013
 2012-2013 Grade B
 Proficiency = Reading - 66%, Math - 54%, Writing - 74%, Science - 50%
 The 2013 Reading AMO targets were not met for the African American and economically disadvantaged sub-groups.
 The 2013 Math AMO targets were not met for the African American, Hispanic or economically disadvantaged sub-groups.
 2011-2012 Grade A
 Proficiency = Reading -66%, Math -52%, Writing -89%, Science -56%
 2010-2011 Grade-A, AYP- No
 Proficiency= Reading- 72%, Math - 70 %, Writing - 88%, Science - 44%; Total populations did not make AYP in reading and math; Black and Ec Dis students did not make AYP in reading and math.
 2009-2010 Grade-A, AYP-; No
 Proficiency= Reading - 75%, Math - 71%, Writing - 92%, Science - 44%; Black and Ec Dis students did not make AYP in reading and math. Assistant Principal of Rochelle School of the Arts from 2006- 2013
 2012-2013 Grade B
 Proficiency = Reading - 66%, Math - 54%, Writing - 74%, Science - 50%
 The 2013 Reading AMO targets were not met for the African American and economically disadvantaged sub-groups.
 The 2013 Math AMO targets were not met for the African American, Hispanic or economically disadvantaged sub-groups.
 2011-2012 Grade A
 Proficiency = Reading -66%, Math -52%, Writing -89%, Science -56%
 2010-2011 Grade-A, AYP- No
 Proficiency= Reading- 72%, Math - 70 %, Writing - 88%, Science - 44%; Total populations did not make AYP in reading and math; Black and Ec Dis students did not make AYP in reading and math.
 2009-2010 Grade-A, AYP-; No
 Proficiency= Reading - 75%, Math - 71%, Writing - 92%, Science - 44%; Black and Ec Dis students did not make AYP in reading and math.

Instructional Coaches

of instructional coaches

1

receiving effective rating or higher

(not entered because basis is < 10)

Instructional Coach Information:

Shelley Reinacher

Full-time / District-based

Years as Coach: 4

Years at Current School: 4

Areas

Mathematics, Science, Other

Credentials

BA Elementary Education, National Board Certification – MC-Generalist, ESOL Endorsement

Performance Record

2012-2013 School Grade C, 43% of students scoring at or above grade level in reading, 47% of students scoring at or above grade level in math, 41% scoring at or above grade level in science, 61% are meeting state standards in writing, 71% making learning gains in reading, 54% making learning gains in math, 80% of the lowest 25% making learning gains in reading, and 42% of the lowest 25% making learning gains in math.

2011-2012: School Grade D, 31% of students scoring at or above grade level in reading, 36% of students scoring at or above grade level in math, 26% scoring at or above grade level in science, 54% are meeting state standards in writing, 54% making learning gains in reading, 49% making learning gains in math, 70% of the lowest 25% making learning gains in reading, and 73% of the lowest 70% making learning gains in math.

2010 – 2011: School Grade C, 43% of students scoring at or above grade level in reading, 53% of students scoring at or above grade level in math, 33% scoring at or above grade level in science, 87% are meeting state standards in writing, 55% making learning gains in reading, 57% making learning gains in math, 60% of the lowest 25% making learning gains in reading, 53% of the lowest 25% making learning gains in math, and 79% of AYP criteria met.

2009-2010: School Grade C, 47% of students scoring at or above grade level in reading, 60% of students scoring at or above grade level in math, 29% scoring at or above grade level in science, 63% are meeting state standards in writing, 62% making learning gains in reading, 72% making learning gains in math, 67% of the lowest 25% making learning gains in reading, 70% of the lowest 25% making learning gains in math, and 82% of AYP criteria met.

Classroom Teachers

of classroom teachers

33

receiving effective rating or higher

33, 100%

Highly Qualified Teachers

97%

certified in-field

32, 97%

ESOL endorsed

17, 52%

reading endorsed

3, 9%

with advanced degrees

11, 33%

National Board Certified

1, 3%

first-year teachers

3, 9%

with 1-5 years of experience

13, 39%

with 6-14 years of experience

15, 45%

with 15 or more years of experience

3, 9%

Education Paraprofessionals

of paraprofessionals

9

Highly Qualified

9, 100%

Other Instructional Personnel

of instructional personnel not captured in the sections above

receiving effective rating or higher

Teacher Recruitment and Retention Strategies

This section meets the requirements of Section 1114(b)(1)(E), P.L. 107-110, NCLB, codified at 20 U.S.C. § 6314(b).

Strategies to recruit and retain highly qualified, certified-in-field, effective teachers to the school, including the person responsible

Administration meets monthly with new teachers. New teachers are partnered with a mentor (veteran teacher).

Administration works closely with college campus job fairs and recruiting at universities, as well as working with district personnel to hire highly qualified staff. We maintain and hire highly qualified interns.

Teacher Mentoring Program/Plan

This section meets the requirements of Sections 1114(b)(1)(D) and 1115(c)(1)(F), P.L. 107-110, NCLB, codified at 20 U.S.C. § 6314(b).

Teacher mentoring program/plan, including the rationale for pairings and the planned mentoring activities

Ms. Bailey is being mentored by Mrs. Renaicher our math/science coach. Mrs. Renaicher is well versed in our school-wide best practices. Mrs. Cabbage is being mentored by Mrs. Stoquert, a highly qualified, experienced teacher who has shown significant gains in her 2012-2013 FCAT results. Both the mentee and mentor teacher instruct 5th grade students. Mrs. Golden is being mentored by Mrs. Morris-Freeman, a highly qualified, experienced teacher. Both are ESE teachers. New teacher meetings will take place monthly, as well as modeling and coaching of effective instructional practices by the mentor teachers and other staff.

Multi-Tiered System of Supports (MTSS) / Response to Intervention (RtI)

This section meets the requirements of Sections 1114(b)(1)(B)(i)-(iv) and 1115(c)(1)(A)-(C), P.L. 107-110, NCLB, codified at 20 U.S.C. § 6314(b).

Data-based problem-solving processes for the implementation and monitoring of MTSS and SIP structures to address effectiveness of core instruction, resource allocation (funding and staffing), teacher support systems, and small group and individual student needs

The MTSS Team met with the School Advisory Council (SAC) and principal to help develop the SIP. The team provided data on: Tier 1, 2, and 3 targets; academic and social/emotional areas that needed to be addressed; helped set clear expectations for instruction (rigor, relevance, and relationships); facilitated the development of a systematic approach to teaching (gradual release, essential questions, activating strategies, teaching strategies, extended thinking, refining, and summarizing); and aligned processes and procedures.

Function and responsibility of each school-based leadership team member as related to MTSS and the SIP

Badonna M. Dardis: The principal provides a common vision for the use of data-based decision-making; models the problem solving process; supervises the development of a strong infrastructure for implementation of MTSS; ensures that the school-based team is implementing MTSS; conducts assessment of MTSS skills of school staff; ensures implementation of intervention support and documentation; ensures and participates in adequate professional learning to support MTSS implementation; develops a culture of expectation with the school staff for the implementation of MTSS school-wide; ensures resources are assigned to those areas in most need; and communicates with parents regarding school-based MTSS plans and activities. Develops or brokers technology necessary to manage and display data, provides professional development and technical support to teachers and staff regarding data management and graphic display.

Monica Grice: Assists the principal in providing a common vision for the use of data-based decision-making; assists in the development of a strong infrastructure of resources for the implementation of MTSS; further assists the principal in the assessment of MTSS skills, implementation of intervention support, and documentation; ensures and participates in professional learning; and communicates with parents concerning MTSS plans and activities. Participates in collection, interpretation, and analysis of data; facilitates development of intervention plans; provides support for intervention fidelity and documentation; assists with professional development for behavior concerns; assists in facilitation data-based decision making activities.

Tonetta Morris-Freeman: Participates in student data collection; integrates core instructional activities/materials/instruction in tiered interventions; and collaborates with administration and general education teachers.

Shelley Reinacher: Develops, leads, and evaluates school core content standards/programs; identifies and analyzes existing literature on scientifically based curriculum/behavior assessment and intervention approaches; identifies patterns of student needs while working with district personnel to identify appropriate, evidence-based intervention strategies; assists with whole school screening programs that

provide early intervening services for children to be considered “at risk”; assists in the design and implementation for progress monitoring, data collection, and data analysis; participates in the design and delivery of professional development; provides support for assessment and implementation monitoring; and models/coaches teachers in areas that need development in order to better meet student educational needs.

Laura Edmonds – Manages existing instructional software; collects and reports data with the MTSS team; organizes testing and progress monitoring schedules and accommodations for student needs; coordinates and provides training of technology software to enhance learning in the classroom; facilitates the use of existing and emerging technology by staff and students; integrates technology use in order to increase student engagement throughout the school; and assists with STEM integration.

Dawn Seefeldt: Participates in collection, interpretation, and analysis of data; facilitates development of intervention plans; provides support for intervention fidelity and documentation; provides professional development and technical evaluation; and assists in facilitation of data-based decision making activities.

Barbara Riley: Provides quality services and expertise on issues ranging from program design to assessment; guides and provides intervention with individual students, in small group, and in whole classroom settings; communicates with child-serving community agencies to support the students’ academic, emotional, behavioral, and social success.

Systems in place that the leadership team uses to monitor the fidelity of the school's MTSS and SIP

The MTSS team will focus meetings on how to improve school/teacher effectiveness and student achievement using the problem solving model.

The MTSS leadership team will meet at least once per month (or more frequently as needed) to engage in the following activities:

- o Review school-wide, grade level, and teacher data to problem solve needed interventions on a systemic level and identify students meeting/exceeding benchmarks as well as those at moderate or high risk for not meeting benchmarks. This will be done at least three times per year or more frequently, if new data is available.
- o Help referring teachers design feasible strategies and interventions for struggling students by collaborating regularly, problem solving, sharing effective practices, evaluating implementation, and assisting in making decisions for school, teacher, and student improvement.
- o Facilitate the process of building consensus, increasing infrastructure, and making decisions about implementation.
- o Focus on improving student achievement outcomes with evidence based interventions implemented with fidelity and frequent progress monitoring.
- o Foster a sense of collegiality and mutual support among educators, by promoting the use of evidence-based interventions, and supporting teachers in carrying out intervention plans.

Data source(s) and management system(s) used to access and analyze data to monitor the effectiveness of core, supplemental, and intensive supports in reading, mathematics, science, writing, and engagement

Baseline data is gathered through August and September. Discovery progress monitoring in math and science for grades 3-5 is utilized. Kindergarten data is gathered for the FLKRS. FAIR data for reading is implemented in grades K-5 for our reading progress monitoring tool. First and second grade (now second and third grade students) instructional data is gathered from the previous year's SAT 10. Third through fifth grade instructional data is gathered from the previous year's FCAT scores.

Progress monitoring data is gathered mid-year and toward the end of the year. Discovery data is monitored during the year in math and science for grades 3-5. Kindergarten, first grade, and second grade data is gathered from the end of the year assessment for math and science. FAIR data is collect for grades K-5. Other progress monitoring data is collected, as needed, for classroom or student progress. This information may be obtained by probes, quick reads, fluency checks, etc.

Diagnostic assessment data is gathered through the FAIR, Discovery, ERDA, and DAR .

End of year data is gathered through FAIR, Discovery, SAT 10, and FCAT. Data is discussed and analyzed at least monthly at the MTSS team meetings, and once a month during the grade level meetings scheduled each Tuesday for grades K-2 and Wednesday for grades 3-5. These meetings are schedule during teacher planning time.

Plan to support understanding of MTSS and build capacity in data-based problem solving for staff and parents

Teachers were trained on MTSS at the beginning of the year; refreshers are continued throughout the year. Weekly meetings to discuss Tier 2 students are conducted and follow up is conducted as well through our school psychologist and guidance counselor.

Increased Learning Time/Extended Learning Opportunities

This section meets the requirements of Sections 1114(b)(1)(B)(ii)(II)-(III), 1114(b)(1)(I), and 1115(c)(1)(C)(i) and 1115(c)(2), P.L. 107-110, NCLB, codified at 20 U.S.C. § 6314(b).

Research-based strategies the school uses to increase the amount and quality of learning time and help provide an enriched and accelerated curriculum:

Strategy: Before or After School Program
Minutes added to school year: 1,320

Leveled readers will be used for the after school extended reading program and V-math will be used for the after school extended math program.

Strategy Purpose(s)

- Instruction in core academic subjects

How is data collected and analyzed to determine the effectiveness of this strategy?

Data will be collected periodically to measure reading growth through assessments on the FOCUS web-site. V-math assessments will be given to measure math growth.

Who is responsible for monitoring implementation of this strategy?

Administration is responsible for monitoring the implementation of the strategies and fidelity of the after school extended math and reading program.

Literacy Leadership Team (LLT)

Names and position titles of the members of the school-based LLT

Name	Title
Badonna Dardis	Principal
Monica Grice	Assistant Principal
Lisa Comparato	Media Specialist
Kendal Leavengood	Kindergarten Teacher
Jessica Amaro	1st Grade Teacher
Perris Davidson	2nd Grade Teacher

Name	Title
Kristin McCain	3rd Grade Teacher
Sheryl Henry	4th Grade Teacher
Sara Stoquert	5th Grade Teacher
Shelley Reinacher	Resource Teacher
Tonetta Morris-Freeman	ESE Teacher

How the school-based LLT functions

The LLT will meet every month beginning in September to discuss professional development needs, examine student data, analyze lesson plans, observations, and plan mentoring activities.

Major initiatives of the LLT

Major initiatives involve increasing student achievement by analyzing and improving reading plans, close reading strategies, vocabulary development, building background knowledge, as well as, reading in the content areas.

Every Teacher Contributes to Reading Instruction

How the school ensures every teacher contributes to the reading improvement of every student

Administration has data chats with teachers about individual students bi-monthly and discusses instructional needs based on the data. The instruction is then evident in the teacher's lesson plans and through observed walk-throughs. Our reading instruction is data driven. We have built in iii flexible groupings during reading that not only address the struggling students, but those that need reading enrichment as well. Students who are struggling are re-taught during small guided group instruction; then they are re-tested to see if they mastered the area in reading in which they struggled.

Preschool Transition

This section meets the requirements of Sections 1114(b)(1)(G) and 1115(c)(1)(D), P.L. 107-110, NCLB, codified at 20 U.S.C. § 6314(b).

Strategies for assisting preschool children in transition from early childhood programs to local elementary school programs

Parents of in-coming Kindergarten students are invited to participate in our "Bridge Bus" that visits the community twice a week. Families become familiar with our school by visiting the bus. We give families books. They also have access to online activities with the computers on the bus.

Literature and Scholastic books are given to the parents to promote the importance of reading and to share Kindergarten GLEs.

A Kindergarten readiness skills test is administered to each student. A copy of the assessment is provided to the parent with specific instructions on activities which they may do with their child to improve his/her readiness.? Auburndale Central has four Pre-Kindergarten Head Start classrooms housing 18 students each under the supervision of a certified teacher and CDAT.

Once the preschool student completes the transition to Kindergarten student, the FKLRS and F.A.I.R. are administered.

Data collected is used to differentiate instruction and design activities to fill gaps or provide enrichment in school readiness and socialization.

The guidance counselor dedicates time and materials to assist the Kindergarten students and parents to make a successful transition into Kindergarten.

Students from the on campus Head start program are given the opportunity to experience a day of

Kindergarten at Auburndale Central.

Parents of both preschool and school-aged children are identified and encouraged to make use of the materials in the parent resource room.

If the percentage of students who are ready to start school according to the FKLRS data continues to increase, then our preschool plan will be deemed effective.

The personnel involved in this program include: media specialist, guidance counselor, math coach, teacher trainer, para-educators, principal, assistant principal, and kindergarten teachers.

Pre-kindergarten students and their parents participate in school-wide programs that provide them with literature and information to make the transition into Kindergarten a smooth process.

Parent feedback is another tool used in evaluating the effectiveness of the Round Up and other parent activities.

Expected Improvements

This section meets the requirements of Sections 1114(b)(1)(A),(H), and (I), and 1115(c)(1)(A), P.L. 107-110, NCLB, codified at 20 U.S.C. § 6314(b).

Area 1: Reading

Annual Measurable Objectives (AMOs) - Students scoring at or above Achievement Level 3 on FCAT 2.0, or scoring at or above Level 4 on FAA

Group	2013 Target %	2013 Actual %	Target Met?	2014 Target %
All Students	45%	43%	No	51%
American Indian				
Asian				
Black/African American	38%	42%	Yes	45%
Hispanic	42%	43%	Yes	48%
White	48%	42%	No	54%
English language learners	28%	34%	Yes	35%
Students with disabilities		36%		
Economically disadvantaged	43%	43%	Yes	49%

Florida Comprehensive Assessment Test 2.0 (FCAT 2.0)

	2013 Actual #	2013 Actual %	2014 Target %
Students scoring at Achievement Level 3	37	21%	27%
Students scoring at or above Achievement Level 4	37	21%	27%

Florida Alternate Assessment (FAA)

	2013 Actual #	2013 Actual %	2014 Target %
Students scoring at Levels 4, 5, and 6		<i>[data excluded for privacy reasons]</i>	0%
Students scoring at or above Level 7		<i>[data excluded for privacy reasons]</i>	100%

Learning Gains

	2013 Actual #	2013 Actual %	2014 Target %
Students making learning gains (FCAT 2.0 and FAA)	123	71%	74%
Students in lowest 25% making learning gains (FCAT 2.0)	24	80%	82%

Comprehensive English Language Learning Assessment (CELLA)

	2013 Actual #	2013 Actual %	2014 Target %
Students scoring proficient in listening/speaking (students speak in English and understand spoken English at grade level in a manner similar to non-ELL students)	45	47%	51%
Students scoring proficient in reading (students read grade-level text in English in a manner similar to non-ELL students)	28	29%	51%
Students scoring proficient in writing (students write in English at grade level in a manner similar to non-ELL students)	30	31%	51%

Postsecondary Readiness

	2012 Actual #	2012 Actual %	2014 Target %
On-time graduates scoring "college ready" on the Postsecondary Education Readiness Test (P.E.R.T.) or any college placement test authorized under Rule 6A-10.0315, F.A.C.			

Area 2: Writing

	2013 Actual #	2013 Actual %	2014 Target %
Florida Comprehensive Assessment Test 2.0 (FCAT 2.0) Students scoring at or above 3.5	39	61%	65%
Florida Alternate Assessment (FAA) Students scoring at or above Level 4	<i>[data excluded for privacy reasons]</i>		100%

Area 3: Mathematics

Elementary and Middle School Mathematics

Annual Measurable Objectives (AMOs) - Students scoring at or above Achievement Level 3 on FCAT 2.0 and EOC assessments, or scoring at or above Level 4 on FAA

Group	2013 Target %	2013 Actual %	Target Met?	2014 Target %
All Students	40%	47%	Yes	1%
American Indian				
Asian				
Black/African American	30%	42%	Yes	37%
Hispanic	43%	46%	Yes	48%
White	40%	47%	Yes	46%
English language learners	30%	42%	Yes	37%
Students with disabilities		29%		
Economically disadvantaged	40%	45%	Yes	46%

Florida Comprehensive Assessment Test 2.0 (FCAT 2.0)

	2013 Actual #	2013 Actual %	2014 Target %
Students scoring at Achievement Level 3	51	29%	32%
Students scoring at or above Achievement Level 4	31	18%	20%

Florida Alternate Assessment (FAA)

	2013 Actual #	2013 Actual %	2014 Target %
Students scoring at Levels 4, 5, and 6	<i>[data excluded for privacy reasons]</i>		100%
Students scoring at or above Level 7	<i>[data excluded for privacy reasons]</i>		100%

Learning Gains

	2013 Actual #	2013 Actual %	2014 Target %
Learning Gains	93	54%	59%
Students in lowest 25% making learning gains (FCAT 2.0 and EOC)	13	42%	48%

Area 4: Science

Elementary School Science

Florida Comprehensive Assessment Test 2.0 (FCAT 2.0)

	2013 Actual #	2013 Actual %	2014 Target %
Students scoring at Achievement Level 3	10	18%	23%
Students scoring at or above Achievement Level 4	13	23%	28%

Florida Alternate Assessment (FAA)

	2013 Actual #	2013 Actual %	2014 Target %
Students scoring at Levels 4, 5, and 6	<i>[data excluded for privacy reasons]</i>		0%
Students scoring at or above Level 7	<i>[data excluded for privacy reasons]</i>		100%

Area 8: Early Warning Systems

Elementary School Indicators

	2013 Actual #	2013 Actual %	2014 Target %
Students who miss 10 percent or more of available instructional time	81	20%	15%
Students retained, pursuant to s. 1008.25, F.S.	46	11%	9%
Students who are not proficient in reading by third grade	28	45%	40%
Students who receive two or more behavior referrals	8	2%	1%
Students who receive one or more behavior referrals that lead to suspension, as defined in s.1003.01(5), F.S.	7	2%	1%

Area 9: Parent Involvement

Title I Schools may use the Parent Involvement Plan to meet the requirements of Sections 1114(b)(1)(F) and 1115(c)(1)(G), P.L. 107-110, NCLB, codified at 20 U.S.C. § 6314(b).

Parental involvement targets for the school

By the Spring of 2014, 85% of all parents will participate in parent involvement activities as indicated by activity sign-in sheets and conference logs.

Specific Parental Involvement Targets

Target	2013 Actual #	2013 Actual %	2014 Target %
Parent involvement as set out by the Parent Involvement Plan	293	71%	85%

Goals Summary

- G1.** Data will inform instruction across all content areas to improve student learning gains.
- G2.** Increase proficiency levels through effective instructional practices.
- G3.** Increase effective reading and writing literacy connections across content areas.

Goals Detail

G1. Data will inform instruction across all content areas to improve student learning gains.

Targets Supported

- Reading (AMO's, FCAT2.0, Learning Gains, CELLA)
- Writing
- Math (Elementary and Middle School, Elementary and Middle AMO's, Elementary and Middle FCAT 2.0, Elementary and Middle Learning Gains)
- Science
- Science - Elementary School
- STEM
- STEM - All Levels
- Parental Involvement
- EWS
- EWS - Elementary School

Resources Available to Support the Goal

- Administration
- Support team
- District Personnel
- F.A.I.R., FLKRS, Discovery data, FCAT data, and formative benchmark assessments and walk through data
- Walk-through data

Targeted Barriers to Achieving the Goal

- Lack of collaborative formative data analysis to drive instruction

Plan to Monitor Progress Toward the Goal

Monitor implementation of instructional practices based on data analysis

Person or Persons Responsible

Administration/Support Staff

Target Dates or Schedule:

Weekly

Evidence of Completion:

Walk-throughs, lesson plans, and data notebooks

G2. Increase proficiency levels through effective instructional practices.

Targets Supported

- All Areas
- Reading (AMO's, FCAT2.0, FAA, Learning Gains, CELLA, Postsecondary Readiness)
- Writing
- Math (Elementary and Middle School, Elementary and Middle AMO's, Elementary and Middle FCAT 2.0, Elementary and Middle FAA, Elementary and Middle Learning Gains)
- Science
- Science - Elementary School
- STEM
- STEM - All Levels
- Parental Involvement
- EWS
- EWS - Elementary School

Resources Available to Support the Goal

- Lesson Study Facilitator
- Support Staff
- District Support
- Administrative PLCs
- Professional Development
- Learning Schedules
- Department of Education Support

Targeted Barriers to Achieving the Goal

- Best practices not utilized with fidelity
- Explicit content language used by students and teachers throughout the lesson

Plan to Monitor Progress Toward the Goal

Increase of student achievement noted through the analysis of F.A.I.R., Discovery, and formative assessment data.

Person or Persons Responsible

Administration/Support Staff/Teachers

Target Dates or Schedule:

On-going

Evidence of Completion:

Data notebooks and data discussions

G3. Increase effective reading and writing literacy connections across content areas.

Targets Supported

- All Areas
- Reading (AMO's, FCAT2.0, FAA, CELLA, Postsecondary Readiness)
- Writing
- Social Studies
- U.S. History EOC
- Civics EOC
- Science - Elementary School
- STEM
- STEM - All Levels
- CTE
- EWS
- EWS - Elementary School
- Additional Targets

Resources Available to Support the Goal

- Administration
- Content area instructional materials
- Support Staff
- District Support Staff
- Department of Education Staff
- Teacher Resource Library
- Common Core
- K-5 Reading Curriculum

Targeted Barriers to Achieving the Goal

- Lack of knowledge of the writing and reading literacy connection
- Teacher's low level of expectations

Plan to Monitor Progress Toward the Goal

Monitoring of reading and writing across the content areas.

Person or Persons Responsible

Administration/Support Staff

Target Dates or Schedule:

On-going

Evidence of Completion:

Lesson plans and student artifacts

Action Plan for Improvement

Problem Solving Key

G = Goal

B = Barrier

S = Strategy

G1. Data will inform instruction across all content areas to improve student learning gains.

G1.B1 Lack of collaborative formative data analysis to drive instruction

G1.B1.S1 Professional development on data analysis to drive instruction

Action Step 1

Organization of teacher and student data notebooks with relevant data needed based on content focus and test item specifications for analysis

Person or Persons Responsible

Administration/Support Staff/Teachers

Target Dates or Schedule

Initial August - On-going

Evidence of Completion

Student and teacher data notebooks

Facilitator:

Administration

Participants:

Administration/Support Staff/Teachers

Action Step 2

MTSS Tier 2 and Tier 3 data collection, graphing, and analysis

Person or Persons Responsible

School Psychologist/Guidance/Teachers/Support Staff

Target Dates or Schedule

Initial August - On-going

Evidence of Completion

Tier data collection

Facilitator:

School Psychologist

Participants:

School Psychologist/Guidance/Teachers/Support Staff

Action Step 3

Student data chats and goal setting

Person or Persons Responsible

Support Staff/Teachers

Target Dates or Schedule

Weekly

Evidence of Completion

Student data notebooks

Action Step 4

Best instructional practices and interventions based on the data.

Person or Persons Responsible

Administration

Target Dates or Schedule

Weekly

Evidence of Completion

Student work samples, walk-through data, and student artifacts

Plan to Monitor Fidelity of Implementation of G1.B1.S1

Monitor implementation of data analysis results through data collection in data notebooks

Person or Persons Responsible

Administration/Support Staff

Target Dates or Schedule

Bi-monthly

Evidence of Completion

Formative assessments - Mastery

Plan to Monitor Effectiveness of G1.B1.S1

Effectiveness will be noted through student mastery of skills and data collected from monitoring of instructional practices

Person or Persons Responsible

Administration/Support Staff/Teachers

Target Dates or Schedule

Bi-monthly

Evidence of Completion

Data evidence of student mastery and quantitative data collected from observations of instructional practices

G2. Increase proficiency levels through effective instructional practices.

G2.B1 Best practices not utilized with fidelity

G2.B1.S2 Best practices noted in lesson plans and observed with fidelity during walk-throughs

Action Step 1

Introduce and review best practices (high yield strategies) the first week of school.

Person or Persons Responsible

Administration

Target Dates or Schedule

During the first week of school, administration will review best practices and meet with new teachers to train them on best practices being implemented school-wide.

Evidence of Completion

Evidence will be noted in agenda that practices were discussed and expectations were given to the staff.

Facilitator:

Administration

Participants:

Administration

Action Step 2

These five areas will be the focus: Explicit vocabulary instruction, Implementation of graphic organizers, Higher order questioning and justification of answers, Collaborative/Cooperative learning Reading and writing in the curriculum

Person or Persons Responsible

Administration will monitor best practices.

Target Dates or Schedule

Implementation of the school-wide best practices during instruction beginning the second week of school and on-going.

Evidence of Completion

Evidence collection will be on-going in lesson plans, observations, and student work samples.

Action Step 3

The five areas of focus will be explicit vocabulary instruction, implementation of graphic organizers, higher order questioning and justification of answers, collaborative/cooperative learning, and reading and writing across the curriculum.

Person or Persons Responsible

Administration

Target Dates or Schedule

The five focus areas - best practices will be monitored during walk-throughs and documented in the teacher electronic evaluation system.

Evidence of Completion

Evidence will be on-going through teacher walk-throughs and collected student artifacts.

Plan to Monitor Fidelity of Implementation of G2.B1.S2

Best practices will be monitored with the focus on vocabulary instruction, graphic organizers, higher order questioning and justification of answers, cooperative/collaborative groups, and reading and writing across the curriculum.

Person or Persons Responsible

Administration will monitor for fidelity of best practices implementation.

Target Dates or Schedule

On-going

Evidence of Completion

Evidence will be noted in lesson plans throughout the year; data will be collected on the teacher evaluation system as to whether the school-wide best practices are implemented with fidelity in order to improve instruction.

Plan to Monitor Effectiveness of G2.B1.S2

We will review whether these best practices, in conjunction with student learning, are increasing student achievement: explicit vocabulary instruction, graphic organizers for summarizing, high order questioning with justification of answers, cooperative/collaborative learning, and reading and writing across the curriculum.

Person or Persons Responsible

Administration

Target Dates or Schedule

During bi-monthly data discussions with teachers, we will note whether the school-wide best practices are having an effect on learning.

Evidence of Completion

Student increased achievement through formative assessments and student work samples.

G2.B5 Explicit content language used by students and teachers throughout the lesson

G2.B5.S1 Marzano's six step Vocabulary Instruction

Action Step 1

Introduction and review of Marzano's 6 Step Vocabulary instruction

Person or Persons Responsible

Teacher facilitator

Target Dates or Schedule

PLCs

Evidence of Completion

PLC sign-in sheet and notes

Facilitator:

Teacher Facilitator

Participants:

Teacher facilitator

Action Step 2

Implementation of Marzano's 6 Step Vocabulary instruction throughout the content areas

Person or Persons Responsible

Teachers

Target Dates or Schedule

On-going

Evidence of Completion

Student journals

Action Step 3

Monitoring of Marzano's 6 Step Vocabulary instruction throughout the content areas

Person or Persons Responsible

Administration/Support Staff

Target Dates or Schedule

on-going

Evidence of Completion

Student journals, instructional observations, and student artifacts

Plan to Monitor Fidelity of Implementation of G2.B5.S1

Implementation of the Marzano's 6 Step Vocabulary

Person or Persons Responsible

Administration/Support Staff

Target Dates or Schedule

On-going

Evidence of Completion

Student journals, instructional observations and student artifacts

Plan to Monitor Effectiveness of G2.B5.S1

F.A.I.R., Discovery assessments and formative assessments

Person or Persons Responsible

Administration/Support Staff/Teachers

Target Dates or Schedule

on-going

Evidence of Completion

Lesson plans, data results, and instructional observations

G3. Increase effective reading and writing literacy connections across content areas.

G3.B1 Lack of knowledge of the writing and reading literacy connection

G3.B1.S1 Professional development on reading and writing connections

Action Step 1

Present language arts anchor standards and identify how writing is imbedded in those standards.

Person or Persons Responsible

Support Staff/Administration

Target Dates or Schedule

September 2013

Evidence of Completion

Teacher observation, student artifacts, and PLC sign-in sheet

Facilitator:

Administration

Participants:

Support Staff/Administration

Action Step 2

Revisit prior year student artifacts and talk about how writing was connected to reading; adjust student expectations at grade levels, as needed.

Person or Persons Responsible

Support Staff/Administration

Target Dates or Schedule

September 2013

Evidence of Completion

Create and utilize a rubric that supports students answering text dependent questions.

Facilitator:

Administration

Participants:

Support Staff/Administration

Action Step 3

Reading and writing to multiple texts

Person or Persons Responsible

Support Staff/Administration

Target Dates or Schedule

On-going

Evidence of Completion

Lesson plans and student artifacts

Action Step 4

Strategies on connecting reading and writing

Person or Persons Responsible

Support Staff/Administration

Target Dates or Schedule

On-going, based on data

Evidence of Completion

Lesson plans, student artifacts, and observations

Facilitator:

Administration

Participants:

Support Staff/Administration

Plan to Monitor Fidelity of Implementation of G3.B1.S1

Vertical progression of rigor noted in reading and writing connections

Person or Persons Responsible

Administration/Support Staff

Target Dates or Schedule

On-going, based on data

Evidence of Completion

Lesson plans, student artifacts, and observations

Plan to Monitor Effectiveness of G3.B1.S1

Monitor rigor of reading and writing connections through data chats and student artifact observations.

Person or Persons Responsible

Administration/Support Staff

Target Dates or Schedule

On-going through PLCs

Evidence of Completion

Student artifacts

G3.B4 Teacher's low level of expectations

G3.B4.S1 Vertical student writing and work samples will be compared and discussed to increase rigor from grade level to grade level. Rigorous rubrics will be developed to increase rigor and spiral curriculum up through the grade levels.

Action Step 1

Review grade level journals and writing expectation samples from the 2012-2013 school year to increase the rigor from one grade to the next.

Person or Persons Responsible

Administration and Teachers

Target Dates or Schedule

August

Evidence of Completion

New rubric for writing will be developed

Facilitator:

Participants:

Administration and Teachers

Action Step 2

Evidence that the rigorous rubric for writing across the curriculum is being implemented and the scoring using the rubric has evidence of high student writing expectations

Person or Persons Responsible

Administration

Target Dates or Schedule

On-going

Evidence of Completion

Student work samples with teachers' grades and specific feedback using the developed rubric.

Facilitator:

Participants:

Administration

Plan to Monitor Fidelity of Implementation of G3.B4.S1

Vertical grade levels will critique and discuss grade level work of the grades below their grade level and above their grade level to ensure rigor and high level of expectations.

Person or Persons Responsible

Administration and vertical teams

Target Dates or Schedule

During vertical teaming

Evidence of Completion

Agenda of vertical teaming and written feedback of next steps to fidelity and rigor.

Plan to Monitor Effectiveness of G3.B4.S1

Monitor rigor of teacher expectations connecting reading and writing.

Person or Persons Responsible

Administration

Target Dates or Schedule

Walk-throughs and during vertical teaming - on-going

Evidence of Completion

Student work samples, walk-through data and written vertical teaming critiques of expectations noted through graded student samples.

Coordination and Integration

This section meets the requirements of Sections 1114(b)(1)(J) and 1115(c)(1)(H), P.L. 107-110, NCLB, codified at 20 U.S.C. § 6314(b).

How federal, state, and local funds, services, and programs are coordinated and integrated at the school

Title I, Part A

Services are provided to ensure students requiring additional remediation are assisted through after-school programs. The district coordinates with Title II and Title III in ensuring staff development.

Title I, Part C- Migrant

Migrant Liaison provides services and support to students and parents. The liaison coordinates with Title I and other programs to ensure student needs are met.

Title I, Part D

District receives funds to support the Educational Alternative Outreach program. Services are coordinated with district Drop-out Prevention programs.

Title II

District receives supplemental funds for improving basic education programs through the purchase of small equipment to supplement education programs. (Ex. Purchase new technology for classrooms.)

Title III

Services are provided through the district for education materials and ELL district support services to improve the education of immigrant and English Language Learners.

Title X- Homeless

District Homeless Social Worker provides resources (clothing, school supplies, social services referrals) for students identified as homeless under the McKinney-Vento Act.

Supplemental Academic Instruction (SAI)

SAI funds will be coordinated with Title I funds to provide summer school for Level 1 readers. SAI funds will be used to expand the summer program to all Level 2 students.

Violence Prevention Programs

The school offers a non-violence and anti-drug program to students that incorporate field trips, community service, drug tests, and counseling.

Appendix 1: Professional Development Plan to Support School Improvement Goals

This section will satisfy the requirements of Sections 1114(b)(1)(D) and 1115(c)(1)(F), P.L. 107-110, NCLB, codified at 20 U.S.C. § 6314(b), by demonstrating high-quality and ongoing professional development for teachers, principals, and paraprofessionals and, if appropriate, for pupil services personnel, parents, and other staff is being offered to enable all children in the school to meet the State's student academic achievement standards.

Professional development opportunities identified in the SIP as action steps to achieve the school's goals.

G1. Data will inform instruction across all content areas to improve student learning gains.

G1.B1 Lack of collaborative formative data analysis to drive instruction

G1.B1.S1 Professional development on data analysis to drive instruction

PD Opportunity 1

Organization of teacher and student data notebooks with relevant data needed based on content focus and test item specifications for analysis

Facilitator

Administration

Participants

Administration/Support Staff/Teachers

Target Dates or Schedule

Initial August - On-going

Evidence of Completion

Student and teacher data notebooks

PD Opportunity 2

MTSS Tier 2 and Tier 3 data collection, graphing, and analysis

Facilitator

School Psychologist

Participants

School Psychologist/Guidance/Teachers/Support Staff

Target Dates or Schedule

Initial August - On-going

Evidence of Completion

Tier data collection

G2. Increase proficiency levels through effective instructional practices.

G2.B1 Best practices not utilized with fidelity

G2.B1.S2 Best practices noted in lesson plans and observed with fidelity during walk-throughs

PD Opportunity 1

Introduce and review best practices (high yield strategies) the first week of school.

Facilitator

Administration

Participants

Administration

Target Dates or Schedule

During the first week of school, administration will review best practices and meet with new teachers to train them on best practices being implemented school-wide.

Evidence of Completion

Evidence will be noted in agenda that practices were discussed and expectations were given to the staff.

G2.B5 Explicit content language used by students and teachers throughout the lesson

G2.B5.S1 Marzano's six step Vocabulary Instruction

PD Opportunity 1

Introduction and review of Marzano's 6 Step Vocabulary instruction

Facilitator

Teacher Facilitator

Participants

Teacher facilitator

Target Dates or Schedule

PLCs

Evidence of Completion

PLC sign-in sheet and notes

G3. Increase effective reading and writing literacy connections across content areas.

G3.B1 Lack of knowledge of the writing and reading literacy connection

G3.B1.S1 Professional development on reading and writing connections

PD Opportunity 1

Present language arts anchor standards and identify how writing is imbedded in those standards.

Facilitator

Administration

Participants

Support Staff/Administration

Target Dates or Schedule

September 2013

Evidence of Completion

Teacher observation, student artifacts, and PLC sign-in sheet

PD Opportunity 2

Revisit prior year student artifacts and talk about how writing was connected to reading; adjust student expectations at grade levels, as needed.

Facilitator

Administration

Participants

Support Staff/Administration

Target Dates or Schedule

September 2013

Evidence of Completion

Create and utilize a rubric that supports students answering text dependent questions.

PD Opportunity 3

Strategies on connecting reading and writing

Facilitator

Administration

Participants

Support Staff/Administration

Target Dates or Schedule

On-going, based on data

Evidence of Completion

Lesson plans, student artifacts, and observations

G3.B4 Teacher's low level of expectations

G3.B4.S1 Vertical student writing and work samples will be compared and discussed to increase rigor from grade level to grade level. Rigorous rubrics will be developed to increase rigor and spiral curriculum up through the grade levels.

PD Opportunity 1

Review grade level journals and writing expectation samples from the 2012-2013 school year to increase the rigor from one grade to the next.

Facilitator

Participants

Administration and Teachers

Target Dates or Schedule

August

Evidence of Completion

New rubric for writing will be developed

PD Opportunity 2

Evidence that the rigorous rubric for writing across the curriculum is being implemented and the scoring using the rubric has evidence of high student writing expectations

Facilitator

Participants

Administration

Target Dates or Schedule

On-going

Evidence of Completion

Student work samples with teachers' grades and specific feedback using the developed rubric.

Appendix 2: Budget to Support School Improvement Goals

Budget Summary by Goal

Goal	Description	Total
	Total	\$0

Budget Summary by Funding Source and Resource Type

Funding Source	Evidence-Based Program	Total
		\$0
Total		\$0

Budget Details

Budget items identified in the SIP as necessary to achieve the school's goals.

G1. Data will inform instruction across all content areas to improve student learning gains.

G1.B1 Lack of collaborative formative data analysis to drive instruction

G1.B1.S1 Professional development on data analysis to drive instruction

Action Step 1

Organization of teacher and student data notebooks with relevant data needed based on content focus and test item specifications for analysis

Resource Type

Evidence-Based Program

Resource

Funding Source

Amount Needed